

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.
PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A. } Representing the Council of the
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.) } Classical Association
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)
J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society
With the co-operation of
PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZGERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LX DECEMBER 1946 Number 3

CONTENTS

EURIPIDES, <i>ELECTRA</i> 567-8 and <i>ALCESTIS</i> 1126-7. P. T. STEVENS	101
ARCHILOCHUS, <i>Fr.</i> 67. W. JAEGER	103
HORACE, <i>ODES</i> I. xxviii. 7-15 and 24. A. Y. CAMPBELL	103
A NOTE ON RICIMER. E. A. THOMPSON	106
LUCAN, i. 405-8. E. J. P. RAVEN	107

REVIEWS:
Isocrates, iii (Van Hook); *Isocrate*, iii (Mathieu), J. TATE, 107; *Plutarque sur l'E de Delphes* (Flacelière), H. J. ROSE, 108; *Héllodore, Éthiopiques*, iii (Rattenbury and Lumb), C. A. TRYPANIS, 109; *Elkots*, v (Wifstrand), R. M. RATTENBURY, 110; *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina* (Campbell), T. E. WRIGHT, 112; *Apulée, Métamorphoses* (Robertson and Vallette), J. F. MOUNTFORD, 113; *Prudence*, ii (Lavarenne), H. J. THOMSON, 116; *Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos* (Cahn), C. T. SELTMAN, 117; *Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen*, vii, xi (van Gulik, Ponger), A. W. LAWRENCE, 119; *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity* (Jasny), D'A. W. THOMPSON, 120; *Oedipe* (Delcourt), H. J. ROSE, 122; *Paideta*, iii (Jaeger), J. TATE, 123; *Greek Studies in England* (Clarke), R. M. RATTENBURY, 125; *Some School Books*, D. S. COLMAN, 126.

SHORT REVIEWS	127
BOOKS RECEIVED	131
INDEXES	133

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 3s. 6d. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32
Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

OUTLINES FOR TEACHING GREEK READING

By DORA PYM, M.A.

Lecturer in Education, University of Bristol

The value of Greek thought, widely acknowledged, remains inaccessible to most people, simply because it is believed that there is no middle course between 'learning Greek' (a term covering years of study) and reading translations.

Mrs. Pym believes that a bridge can be built between the translation and the original, and outlines here her method for doing so. The specimen scheme for ten lessons in Greek Reading is adaptable for use in schools or adult classes.

From all Booksellers

1s.

JOHN MURRAY

El. 56

Πρ.
ΗΛ.

δέδου
jectur
the to
ment
the
defen
editio
mean
the p
βλέψ
σύ γ'
phys
sible
passa
the e

Pe
print
φρον
sense
at hi
mino
rath
the o
ent
sym
by L
δέδο
wher
the
ιδού

Th
Eur
pres
som
mak
pres
the
sent
the
pide
σοὺς

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1946

EURIPIDES, *ELECTRA* 567-8 AND *ALCESTIS* 1126-7

El. 567-8:

Πρ. βλέπον νυν ἐς τόδ', ὦ τέκνον, τὸν φίλτατον.
 Ηλ. πάλαι δέδορκα μὴ σὺ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆς.

δέδοικα in place of δέδορκα was conjectured by Victorius and is printed in the texts of Wecklein, Keene, and Parmentier. Murray's Oxford text keeps the manuscript reading, and this is defended by Denniston, in his recent edition, on the ground that 'Electra means the old man to take δέδορκα in the physical sense at first, answering his βλέπον, until she rounds on him with μὴ σὺ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆς'. This 'shift from physical to mental vision' seems possible but a trifle forced. (*Alc.* 1126-7, a passage cited as parallel, is discussed at the end of this note.)

Perhaps we should keep δέδορκα but print a colon after it and take μὴ . . . φρονῆς as an independent sentence. The sense would then be, 'I've been looking at him all the time; can it be that your mind is wandering?' The tone of this, rather than the sarcastic taking up of the old man's word to use it in a different sense, is more in keeping with the sympathetic consideration shown to him by Electra in 555 and 560, and πάλαι δέδορκα is then in similar vein to 566, where in answer to a request to pray to the gods she replies, humouring him, ἰδοῦ· καλῶ θεούς.

There is perhaps no exact parallel in Euripides to this use of μὴ with the present subjunctive¹ to indicate that something may prove to be true, i.e. to make a cautious statement about the present. But first, the use of μὴ with the aorist subjunctive in independent sentences to express apprehension about the future is well established in Euripides and earlier; e.g. *Alc.* 315 μὴ . . . σοὺς διαφθεῖρη γάμους, *H.F.* 1399 ἀλλ'

αἷμα μὴ σοῖς ἐξομόρξωμαι πέπλοις, *Or.* 776 μὴ λάβωσί σ' ἄσμενοι. The usage probably goes back to Homer, e.g. *Il.* xvi. 128 μὴ δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι. Secondly, in *Tr.* 982 μὴ οὐ πείσῃς σοφούς² we have a statement about the future ironically expressed as apprehension, 'I'm afraid you won't persuade'. *Ar. Ec.* 795 μὴ γὰρ οὐ λάβῃς ὅποι may be another instance, though text and interpretation are doubtful. Finally, the use of μὴ with present subj. to express possibility in the present is found in Hdt. v. 79 ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μὴ οὐ τοῦτο ᾗ τὸ μαντήμιον 'but perhaps this is not the meaning of the oracle', and in Hipp. i. 110, 10 (Teubner ed.) μὴ γὰρ οὐκ εὐαρίθμητον ᾗ. It is also, of course, frequent in later prose dialogue, e.g. Plato, *Meno* 94 e ἀλλὰ μὴ οὐκ ᾗ διδακτὸν ἀρετή.

To the examples in Hdt. and Hipp. we should perhaps add Soph. *O.C.* 1179-80

Θη. ἀλλ' εἰ τὸ θάκημ' ἐξαναγκάζει σκόπει
 μὴ σοι πρόνοι' ᾗ τοῦ θεοῦ φυλακτέα.

where Jebb punctuates as above, translates 1180 by 'What if thou hast a duty of respect for the god?' and, in his note, treats μὴ . . . ᾗ as equivalent to the Platonic use. On the other hand, it may be felt that though σκόπει, strictly speaking, is to be taken with the preceding εἰ clause, it is intended to have some influence on the following μὴ clause, which is not, in effect, completely independent. But even if this passage is not actually an example of the Platonic use of μὴ in cautious statements, it is clearly a close approximation to it.

The evidence suggests that this idiom may be Ionic in origin, and was in regular use in fourth-century Athens. If it were already a conversational idiom in the fifth century, we might have expected to find some instances

¹ On independent μὴ with subj. in general see Kühner-Gerth, i, § 394, 7; Goodwin, *M. and T.* §§ 261-70; Stahl, *Syntax des griechischen Verbums*, i, pp. 366-8.

² Accepting, with most editors, Seidler's correction.

in the comic dramatists; but although these are wanting, the usage may have made its appearance in certain philosophical or scientific circles, and if so might well occur in Euripides.¹

In *Alc.* 1126-8

Hr. οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τήνδ' ὄρῃς δάμαρτα σήν.

Ad. ὦρα γε μή τι φάσμα νερτέρων τόδ' ἦ.

Hr. οὐ ψυχγαγωγὸν τόνδ' ἐποίησά ξένον.

Denniston finds three objections to ὦρα:² that the use of γε with an imperative is here too forceful in tone; that the use of ὄρῃς followed by ὦρα in a different sense is awkward in the absence of any special stylistic effect; that the manuscript reading suggests that Admetus regards Heracles as a fellow dupe, whereas the context³ rather suggests suspicion of H. as the author of, or partner to, a deception. He accordingly emends to ὄρῳ, giving this a double sense (as for δέδορκα in *El.* 556), both 'see', looking back to ὄρῃς, and 'beware', looking forward to μή . . . ἦ.

Of these objections the second should not carry too much weight, since a certain carelessness in this sort of repetition is not uncommon in E.,⁴ and the third seems to me to demand a rather more rigidly logical sequence of argument than the circumstances require. In the first place I should take ὦρα not so much as a direct admonition, 'Be on your guard lest . . .', but rather as a more general *caveat*, equivalent in force to a

¹ After I had written this note my attention was drawn to Mr. J. Jackson's suggestion in *C.Q.* xxxv (1941), p. 182. At *El.* 568 he reads

πάλαι δέδορκα.—μή σὺ γ' οὐκέτι εὖ φρονεῖς.

and takes δέδορκα as I have done, but treats μή σὺ γ' as an independent sentence. This elliptical use of μή σὺ γε is certainly common, but in this passage it is intelligible only in the light of a piece of stage business which Mr. Jackson suggests, but of which the text gives no definite indication. This particular action ('the old man makes a motion to lead her to her brother') is not difficult to imagine, but in view of the general practice of the tragedians to indicate any essential 'business' in the text, it is perhaps better not to have recourse to imagination of this kind.

² See *C.R.* xliii. 119; xlv. 214.

³ This amounts as far as I can see to 1128, which on Denniston's view is a defensive remark and incompatible with the absence of suspicion against H. in the previous line as printed above.

⁴ e.g. αἰσχύνομαι in *El.* 44, 45.

suspicious question.⁵ 'Are you sure it isn't a phantom?'—not indicating suspicion of Heracles' complicity in any deception, yet not stressing the absence of any such suspicion. This weaker sense of ὦρα is probable in *Soph. Alead.* fr. 85

δοκῶ μὲν, οὐδείς· ἀλλ' ὦρα μὴ κρείσσον ἦ
καὶ δυσσεβοῦντα τῶν ἐναντίων κρατεῖν
ἢ δοῦλον αὐτῶν ὄντα τῶν πέλας κλύειν.

Secondly, Heracles' reply οὐ . . . ξένον does not prove that the previous line expressed or implied any particular suspicion against him. If the woman is not Alcestis, then even if Admetus has pointedly refrained from suggesting it, some deception on Heracles' part is one of the possibilities, and it is not unnatural that H. should vary his reassurances in more general terms (in 1126 and 1130) by assuring Admetus that he has not been entertaining a sorcerer unawares. The connexion of thought between 1127 and 1128 is 'You ask me if I'm sure it isn't a phantom: well, I brought her here, and I'm no sorcerer.' On this view these two lines fit into the series of appeals by Admetus followed by reassuring replies by Heracles,⁶ whereas ὄρῳ γε μή would break in with a different tone, more self-reliant and, with the double sense of ὄρῳ, a little sarcastic.

For these reasons I do not think that the case for emending is at all conclusive. If we do accept ὄρῳ, there is the possibility that we have here another example of independent μή with the subjunctive, the sense being 'I see her all right; I'm wondering if it is only a phantom.' But this usage is less suitable here, since Admetus has expressed a similar doubt in 1125, and though repeated expressions of incredulity on his part are quite natural, this particular idiom is generally used to express the first intimation that something may prove to be true.⁷

P. T. STEVENS.

University of Liverpool.

⁵ Cf. the common use in Plato of ὦρα μὴ with indic. in a similar sense, e.g. *Theaet.* 145 C ἀλλ' ὦρα μὴ παίζων ἔλεγεν, 'are you sure he wasn't joking?'

⁶ Continuing from 1125 to 1132.

⁷ The asyndeton would also be difficult here.

ARCHILOCHUS, FR. 67

Θυμέ, θυμ' ἀμυγχανοῖσι κήδεσσιν κυκλώμενε,
 ἀνάνδῃ, δυσμενῶν δ' ἄλγεον προσβαλὼν ἐναντίον
 στέρνον, ἐν δοκοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεῖς
 ἀσφαλῆως· καὶ μήτε νικῶν ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο
 μηδὲ νικηθεὶς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο.
 ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσιν τε χαίρει καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχήλα
 μὴ λήνῃ· γίγνωσκε δ' ὅλος βύσμος ἀνθρώπους ἔχει.

THE meaning of the first lines is clear, but the words in v. 3 ἐν δοκοῖσιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεῖς | ἀσφαλῆως contain a serious difficulty. What is ἐν δοκοῖσιν? If we take ἐν to be the preposition, the noun depending upon it would be δοκός. This word is used as feminine by Homer in the concrete sense of 'bearing-beam' or 'main-beam' ('especially in the roof or floor of a house', Liddell and Scott). Accordingly δοκοθήκη is a stone with a hole for the insertion of the roof-beam, and δοκῶδης means 'beam-like'. δοκός also signifies the bar of a gate or a rafter; οἰκία δεδοκυμένη is 'a house furnished with rafters'. The word has the same concrete meaning in the proverbial phrase ὁ τὴν δοκὸν φέρων, 'one who has swallowed a poker' (Ar. *Rhet.* 1413^b28). It is also used later of a kind of meteor of a special shape.

There is another noun δόκος (masc.) used by Xenophanes in the famous line (fr. 30. 4, Diehl):

... δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.

The grammarians have distinguished it from the feminine δοκός by giving it a different accent. It is synonymous with δόξα (as opposed to ἀλήθεια).

Neither δοκός nor δόκος yields the sense required by the context.

Obviously the passage has been a *crux philologorum* since ancient times. Hesychius explains ἔνδοκος by ἐνέδρα, 'ambush'. This makes excellent sense

and is exactly what the situation leads one to expect, but there are several new difficulties in accepting this explanation. The supposed noun ἔνδοκος, recorded by Hesychius, has no parallels and is odd. The simple dative ἐνδόκοισιν would perhaps not be impossible—ἐνδόκοισιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεῖς—but it seems more natural to take ἐν as the preposition before the dative, for we expect 'in an ambush of thine enemies take a stand near them firmly' (ἐχθρῶν belonging both to 'ambush' and to πλησίον). Thus Hesychius' strange gloss ἔνδοκος leads one to suspect that it was derived from one corrupt passage of Archilochus alone. But this of course does not prevent Hesychius' explanation ἐνέδρα from being correct: he probably took it as usual from a marginal scholium of the manuscript in which he (or his source) found the mysterious complex of letters ΕΝΔΟΚΟΙΣΙΝΕΧΘΡΩΝ, and he incorporated into his lexicon the hypothetical lemma ἔνδοκος· ἐνέδρα. It is not difficult to substitute the correct Greek word for 'ambush' in Archilochus' text: the poetical equivalent for the prosaic ἐνέδρα is λόχος, which occurs frequently in Homer. This emendation explains at the same time how the corruption originated: by a simple palaeographical mistake. Δ and Λ are frequently confused in uncial script, just as are Κ and Χ. Therefore ΕΝΔΟΧΟΙΣΙΝΕΧΘΡΩΝ can safely be restored to this passage in Archilochus by virtue of the authentic explanation ἐνέδρα given by ancient grammatical tradition.

WERNER JAEGER.

Harvard University.

HORACE, ODES I. xxviii. 7-15 and 24

IN studying this poem for my edition (published last year) I hesitated for a couple of minutes at line 8; but not, I must confess, over the proper name. I passed it without question as such.

What somewhat bemused me was the phrase *remotus in auras*, which seemed vague and indeed feeble. I then re-

flected that Tithonus was, after all, a vague and, eventually at least, a feeble figure (for I too can unconsciously cheat myself in defence of a tradition); moreover there seemed no ready means of recasting the phrase, and indeed not even space enough for any more recognizable allusion to this mortal's peculiar position

as Aurora's husband. And finally the numerous acknowledged difficulties of this ode, and others not acknowledged, were far more palpable and clamant.

Since then it has proved a salutary experience to come face to face with such a piece of real criticism as the brief note by Mr. J. G. Griffith in *C.R.* lix. 44-5. But surely the blow which he has so quietly dealt to all traditional conceptions of this mythological instance of mortality is more devastating than he is himself aware.

The best that he can force himself to say in defence of such a reference here is that '*occidit*' as applied to Tithonus is a poetic inexactitude'. Why drag in 'poetic'? What is this 'poem' about? A matter in which to be anything short of exact is fatal; a person is either dead or alive. To illustrate the stern truth that 'all die' by adducing one who lived so interminably and so ineffectively that he *might* as well have been dead is not to illustrate but to disprove it. Mr. Griffith shows that nowhere in all classical literature is there any reference to Tithonus as having died at all. But turn to the positive side. Tithonus did not die; he was alive when Horace wrote this poem; see for example Virgil, *Aen.* iv. 585, Ovid, *Fast.* i. 461, vi. 473; for nobody surely is going to claim such descriptions as intended to be equally historical with their contexts. Of course it is only poetically that he is alive; but that is just the point, since it is only in poetry that Tantalus is dead, only poetically true that he and Minos had associated with gods when alive, and that Euphorbus even when reincarnated as Pythagoras had to die yet once again. (Mr. Griffith restricts his lemma and his argument to verses 7-9; I have very different game afoot.) Myth is our poet's material, or rather it is his authority. In plain language, of all conceivable, or rather inconceivable, illustrations here Tithonus is the very worst that could have been chosen.¹

So now that the phrase which I had perfunctorily justified to myself by a

¹ Further evidence consists in IV. vii. 25-6, where the same moral is illustrated by a case which is virtually the opposite.

romantic name is found to have therein no really colourable sanction after all, it may be worth while to look a little closer at that phrase. Wickham renders it 'rapt into the sky', and Lewis and Short state (s.v., C. 3. a) that *aurae* means 'Heaven'. That is a complete fallacy: *in auras* means 'into the air'; e.g. Virg. *Aen.* ix. 51 *iaculum . . . emittit in auras*; cf. Lucr. iii. 221, Virg. *Aen.* ii. 759, 791, v. 740, vii. 466, and *passim* in the poets. L. and S.'s first illustration for 'the upper air, Heaven, on high' is Virg. *Geo.* iii. 109, where *uidentur . . . assurgere in auras* of course means merely that the racing chariots appear to bound through the air rather than travel along the ground; so that *assurgere* itself imparts to *in auras* no great elevation; and our phrase has not even any term implying 'upwards'. At *Aen.* iii. 422 *sub auras* in itself means only 'up into the air'; it is not until the following phrase (cf. iv. 176-7) that we get the stock hyperbole of *sidera*, for which hyperbole *in auras* requires the material addition *aetherias* at *Geo.* ii. 291 and *Aen.* iv. 445. And, generally, *aurae* is never used of heaven except with *caeli* (e.g. *Aen.* vii. 543), *aetheriae* (ibid. 557), and so forth; with which additions it is sporadic.² Even with *superas* at *Aen.* v. 427, *ad auras* only means that the rival boxers raised their arms.³ If it is insisted that Aurora's bed must have been on the horizon, then 'carried a long way through the air' will be so far adequate to the facts; but that is all that this expression can really mean. What a bare, flat description; contrast Eur. *Tro.* 847-55. And what a pitiful title to fame; what a phrase to set against *conuiuia deorum*⁴ and *Iouis ar-*

² The air of earth and the ether of heaven, being continuous, are, it is true, occasionally spoken of as one clime, the heavenly clime; but only from the standpoint of the infernal region, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* vi. 760-2, Ov. *Met.* iv. 478; this is of course quite another matter. My various statements can be verified from the references in the *Thesaurus*.

³ Cf. *Aen.* ii. 699 *se tollit ad auras*; 'stately poetic for "up"' (Sidgwick).

⁴ I am complaining of the phrase, not the idea, which was (to this extent) adequate, at least for Virgil; *Ed.* iv. 63. Had that been his point, H. could at least have turned out, say, *quemque Aurora toro sociavit*.

canis admissus! Taken for a long ride!

The fact is, Tithonus is disqualified for this context by an inadequacy other than his failure to die. When Horace catalogues examples of our common mortality he consoles us, as his model Lucretius did, by naming figures of eminence and distinction, the early kings of Rome (iv. vii. 15), Prometheus, and Tantalus (ii. xviii. 35 ff.); and above all is that so here. Archytas the great savant, whose mind roamed the elements—even he died; well, did not Tantalus die, and Minos, and Pythagoras whom—it is emphasized—Archytas himself reckoned a great natural philosopher. And Tithonus?—one of those men who acquire notoriety as the husbands of their wives; the old gentleman whom Aurora left in her bed every morning when she rose for the day's work. Was it Horace who inserted Tithonus here? I will no longer believe it.¹

I suggest that this is one of those many lines of ancient books in which the first letter was missing or indecipherable, and that somebody was doing his editorial best, at two points, with the puzzle [...] *Tithonus*. He gave, perhaps in the margin, the one Horatian proper noun he could think of; he knew, indeed, that *reuectus in auras* did not fit Tithonus, who of course was translated only once for all; but he imagined that if *remotus* was to be substituted, it would; so this too he entered. But he ought to have left the then existing participle in sole possession; and for the noun he should have restored *Sithonius*. For *in auras*, of course, means not to heaven but to earth. *superas ad (in, sub) auras* has that reference as opposed to the underworld at Virg. *Geo.* iv. 486, *Aen.* vi. 128, vii. 768, *Ov. Met.* x. 11, as also in Avienus, Claudian, and others; but *aurae* are the airs we breathe, and in a decisive context the epithet may be dispensed with; a virtually exact

parallel for my phrase is Sen. *Herc. fur.* 623 *in auras editum* of the returning Hercules. Similarly *in auras* is used of birth, with epithet (*Ov. Met.* vii. 127) or without (ix. 705). 'The Thracian once re-transported to the realms of air' had been conveyed, of course, by the *portitor Orci*, Virg. *Geo.* iv. 502; and for this the Horatian word is *reuectus*; cf. generally ii. xviii. 34-8 'nec satelles Orci callidum Promethea reuexit auro captus. hic superbum Tantalum . . . coercet'. In Horace this verb denotes a (homeward) *voyage*; *Sat.* ii. v. 4, *Epod.* xiii. 16; my line would be as precise as the other is insipid.

So much for expression. In content the advantages of this reconstruction are surely overwhelming. (i) Here is a figure wholly worthy to consort not only with 'proud' Tantalus but even with Minos and Pythagoras; a figure to Horace not only poetical (I. xii. 7-12, xxiv. 13-14, III. xi. 13-24) but distinguished, a humanist and a pioneer (*Ars* 391-3). (ii) Tantalus and Minos are notoriously denizens of the infernal world, for Horace as for others (cf. II. xviii. 37, *Epod.* xvii. 65-6, *Sat.* I. i. 68; *Carm.* iv. vii. 21); Euphorbus-Pythagoras is here definitely envisaged as among the shades; surely the remaining instance also was someone having popular associations with the underworld, at the least a distinguished visitor such as Theseus and Pirithous,² who illustrate the same moral at iv. vii. 27-8. Tithonus, on the other hand, not only never died, but nowhere has the remotest connexion with the house of Hades. (iii) In the second and fourth examples we now have a pair, the two great founders of ascetic mysticism. (iv) I myself attach very much significance to the fact that no other³ reference here could produce such perfection of balance in this quaternion of illustrations; the second and fourth examples now both represent figures who in one way or another descended into the lower world and returned again; and this correspondence

¹ There is another oddity worth mention; it is, despite some commentators, strange to instance even Tithonus as one who had to die, without making any reference whatever to his *longa senectus* (cf. II. xvi. 30), such as *Auroraque senex male uiuax*.

² Pirithous was interned; Orpheus threatened to remain, *Ov. Met.* x. 38-9.

³ Hercules, who *arces altiguit igneas* (III. iii. 10), would for that reason have been less suitable.

is emphasized. That, I think, is why we have *in auras* and not *ab umbris*, because antithesis is wanted for 'iterum Orco demissum'. (v) *reuectus in auras* answers to *conuiuia deorum* as a supernatural elevation one grade lower. (vi) In 23 B.C., when *Odes* I-III were fresh from publication, all readers would still have clearly in their memories the beautifully written episode which Virgil had inserted in his fourth *Georgic* only three years previously. They would appreciate the compliment. And there would be no doubt in their minds that the person here referred to had once died.

At 24, *capiti* <huic>, which I adopted, produces a somewhat harsh elision, and

it would be fair to claim that emendation has hardly the right to introduce such a feature into a plangent poem where it must then be unique (cf. 10, 18, 19). There seems no reason why Horace should have preferred that to the more natural *ossibus* <his> *capiti*<que> *in-humato*, an alternative which has since occurred to me, and one in which the corruption would be at least as easy to explain. A further advantage of this reading is that it involves a neat and characteristically Horatian cross-reference device in a form exactly parallel to II. viii. 3-4.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

A NOTE ON RICIMER

MÜLLER, *F.H.G.* iv, p. 102 *a* prints the last sentence of Priscus, frag. 24, thus: *ἐπεμπε* (sc. Avitus in A.D. 456) *δὲ καὶ τὸν πατρίκιον 'Ρεκίμερ ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν σὺν στρατῷ*, and has thereby caused some misunderstanding among historians. Seeck, *Untergang*, vi, p. 477 n. on p. 332, 4 is inclined, on the strength of this passage, to accuse Priscus of making a mistake. 'Doch ist es nicht unzweifelhaft,' he writes, 'ob nicht Priscus ihm vorgreifend einen Titel beigelegt hat, den er damals noch nicht besass.' He cites Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* ii, p. 29, which shows that Ricimer was only a *comes* at the time of this expedition to Sicily, and i, p. 305, where we learn that in A.D. 457 *Ricimer mag. mil. patricius factus est pridie kl. Marcias*. N. H. Baynes, *J.R.S.* xii, 1922, p. 226, accepts Seeck's position and states that 'doubtless . . . Priscus ante-dates the giving of the title [of *patricius*] to Ricimer'. W. Ensslin, *Klio*, xxiv, 1931, p. 489 f. agrees ('freilich sicher eine Vorwegnahme').

But Priscus is not guilty. Müller has unfortunately given his readers no indication that *πατρίκιον* here is only a conjecture of Niebuhr, who incorporates it in his text (p. 217, Bonn). Dindorf, *Hist. Gr. Min.* i, p. 336 has *ἐπεμπε δὲ καὶ τὸν 'Ρεκίμερ, κτλ.*, and he too gives no hint that his reading is not in the manuscripts. All the manuscripts have *ἐπεμπε δὲ καὶ παρὰ τὸν 'Ρεκίμερ, κτλ.*, and de Boor, in his edition of Constantine

VII, *De Legationibus* (Berlin, 1903), i, p. 152, prints this, although it is not easy to see how we should translate it. In his critical note ad loc. de Boor suggests *ἐπεμπε δὲ καὶ παραντὰ 'Ρεκίμερα, κτλ.* The form *'Ρεκίμερα* is certainly right, for we see from fr. 29 that Priscus declined the name; but it may be objected to *παραντὰ* that Priscus does not elsewhere use this form, although he has *παραντίκα* and *παραχρήμα*.¹ It is perhaps safer therefore to print the sentence thus: *ἐπεμπε δὲ καὶ παρὰ τὸν 'Ρεκίμερα ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν † σὺν στρατῷ*. Ricimer, then, was already in Sicily, and Avitus now sends someone to him with an army. What the missing name was we have no means of telling, but if it ended in *-ανόν*, like many late Roman names, we could explain its disappearance by homoeoteleuton after *Σικελίαν*.

At any rate, Niebuhr's conjecture should be rejected: it ascribes to the historian a mistake which we have no reason to believe that he committed. Priscus makes several mistakes in matters relating to events taking place beyond the Roman frontiers, but there seems to be no certain example in his work of an error in internal Roman affairs.

E. A. THOMPSON.

King's College, London.

¹ Incidentally, LS⁹ quote *παρευθής* from Priscus, p. 325, 32 Dindorf, but according to the most recent editor, de Boor, the MSS. have *παρευθύ* there.

Quaer
urget
ius ha
Circiu
THE o
of Mo
north-
effect
the M
saurus
is a no
Circiu
to say
expos
same
Pilot

(1) I
tio
III
+
bri
Pro
125
(2) I
tra
III
Pa
60
VAN
(C.R.
by tr
Plata
the n
to be
Th
that
most
them
unfai
which
vmas
the r
ment
more
and
a per
dotic
Th
to th
attem

LUCAN i. 405-8

Quaque sub Herculeo sacratus nomine portus
urget rupe caua pelagus: non Corus in illum
ius habet aut Zephyrus, solus sua litora turbat
Circius et tuta prohibet statione Monoeci.

THE only wind which causes a heavy sea at the port of Monaco, says Lucan, is *Circius*; winds from the north-west and west (*Corus* and *Zephyrus*) have no effect on it. The commentators identify *Circius* as the Mistral, and the passages quoted in the *The-saurus* (s.v.) strongly support them. But the Mistral is a north-westerly or northerly wind, as we know *Circius* to have been; it is strange then for Lucan to say that Monaco is protected from *Corus* but exposed to *Circius*, which blows from much the same quarter. Furthermore, the *Mediterranean Pilot* (ii. 132) tells us that Monaco harbour is pro-

tected naturally from northerly, westerly, and southerly winds, but not from the east; even with the shelter of two modern jetties 'the harbour is hardly practicable with winds from this direction'. Clearly an easterly wind is required in this passage.

Now the next commonest gale after the Mistral in the Gulf of Lyons and along the French Riviera is the easterly or south-easterly 'Marin', as it is now called (*Med. Pilot*, ii. 4, 7, 8). This is probably the wind that Lucan should have mentioned in connexion with Monaco, but by one of those geographical mistakes which are common in his work, he substitutes the better-known *Circius*.

E. J. P. RAVEN.

University of Aberdeen.

REVIEWS

ISOCRATES

- (1) Isocrates. With an English translation by La Rue VAN HOOK, Ph.D. Vol. III. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. x + 524. London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1945. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

- (2) Isocrate: *Discours*. Texte établi et traduit par Georges MATHIEU. Tome III. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 182. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 60 fr.

VAN HOOK has completed Norlin's work (*C.R.* xlii, 1928, p. 223; xlii, 1930, p. 66) by translating *Evagoras*, *Helen*, *Busiris*, *Plataicus*, the six forensic speeches, and the nine letters, all of which he believes to be genuine.

The text of this volume is 'based on' that of Blass. Critical notes are few and mostly unimportant. Almost half of them list divergences from Blass; a not unfair sample is that on *Plataicus* 3, which simply records Blass's deletion of *ὅμως* 'without good reason'. Among the rest the note on *Busiris* 2 deserves mention: 'ταῦτά γ' Warmington'. A more improbable γε I have rarely seen; and the *ταῦτα* δ' of the text exhibits a perfectly normal and natural apodictic δέ.

The translation keeps very faithfully to the Greek and makes little or no attempt to recast the lengthy periods.

Sometimes its closeness leads to the ambiguity common in the construe of the more incautious student, as at *Evag.* 10: orators 'must use with precision only words in common use'. But as a rule Van Hook is at his best when he adheres most closely to the original; he is not happy in such departures as at *Helen* 42 where he stultifies the period by dropping the antithesis between *σωμάτων* and *δωρεῶν*. Downright mistakes are not numerous, but they do exist. I offer a few examples. In *Helen* 4 *τόπον* does not mean 'method' (perhaps it was misread as *τρόπον*); οἱ of οἱ γάρ cannot be pronominal (6); *πλέον ἔσχευ* is not 'surpassed' but 'got a bigger portion' (61). At *De Bigis* 27 the translation misrepresents Isocrates as saying that at the time of Marathon the Persians 'had invaded all Greece'. At *Evag.* 29 'held to his resolution' is wrong for *ὥστερ . . . οὕτω διέκειτο τὴν γνώμην*; and at 78 *διατριβῶν* does not depend on *παίδευσιν*. In *Against Lochites* *ἐνσημανεῖσθε* ought not to be translated as an imperative (22); and the difference between a *γραφὴ ὕβρεως* and a *δίκη αἰκίας*, which is nowhere explained, is obscured by translating *ὕβρις* as 'assault and battery', which is rather *αἰκία*.

The introductions to the various speeches are short but probably suffi-

cient except on the historical side, where too much is left to the casual footnotes. Little need be said of these except that they show no improvement on those in the two previous volumes, and it is hard to see to what kind of reader they are addressed. They make no attempt to give either an accurate or a comprehensive picture of the course of events to which Isocrates refers. Thus, for example, no warning is given about the garbled history of Alcibiades in *De Bigis*, except for an incidental reference to Thucydides vi on one small point. But on the whole this volume is a favourable specimen of its series.

(2) The Budé volume contains *De Pace*, *Areopagiticus*, and *Antidosis*, and attains the same high standard as its predecessors (*C.R.* xlv, 1930, p. 66; liv, 1940, p. 86). The French translation is in first-rate prose, making good use of Cartelier for *Antidosis*. Here there is no parasitical clinging to the Greek; yet the faithfulness of the translation is beyond cavil, though one might disagree with some details, such as a certain fondness for translating *πλημέλεια* as 'contradiction' (e.g. *De Pace* 56), which does not always seem appropriate. The introductions and notes deal concisely and thoroughly with such matters as

Isocrates' 'humanism' (which Mathieu seems to me to esteem too highly), his political views and their modifications, and his method of working up selected historical events into a 'composite picture' very loosely related to the facts. The implication of a note on p. 151 that Aristotle had a 'hidden doctrine' is surely mythical. In the interesting section on Isocrates' relations with Plato the resemblance, such as it is, between *Phaedr.* 279 a and Isocrates, *Letter* v. 5 seems a very precarious reason for believing—what may of course be true for all we know—that Isocrates 'semble avoir regardé le jugement de Socrate comme un éloge' (p. 92). On such passages as *Antidosis* 271 ff. where Isocrates 'se refusait à admettre que la vertu pût résulter uniquement d'un enseignement' (p. 91) it should be added that the reference to Plato is neither so certain nor so just as is usually assumed; there is a sense in which for Plato *ἀρετή* can be prior to *ἐπιστήμη* (see e.g. *Rep.* 409 d). But this is a stimulating and masterly work which will receive a welcome no less warm because delayed for reasons which Isocratean 'humanism' was powerless to alter or withstand.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

PLUTARCH'S *E APUD DELPHOS*

Robert FLACELIÈRE: *Plutarque sur l'Éde Delphes*. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, 3^e série, fasc. 11.) Pp. 97. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1941. Paper, 40 fr.

THIS is a pleasant, handy little edition of the *De EI apud Delphos*, but quite unimportant, save as a guide for those new to the *Moralia* who wish to dip into that reservoir of first-century thought and speculation without too much effort. The editor, who had already produced in the same series a similar edition of the *De Pythiae Oraculis*, is plainly a man of good sense (witness, for example, his account of Plutarch's own attitude towards the proposed solutions of the riddle set by the famous *EI*, pp. 18 ff.), interested in his subject and scholarly enough to avoid all the more glaring faults into

which a less acute mind, or less knowledge of Greek, might have led him. His text presents nothing remarkable. Of new manuscript evidence, indeed, if there is any still lurking in unvisited corners of libraries, none could be expected in a book produced at that date, but he does not always make the most of what helps there are. Thus, at 393 b, the manuscripts of Plutarch offer *προσεθίζειν*, which is nonsense; Eusebios gives *προσαγορεύειν*, pretty clearly an interpolation. Flacelière simply prints Eusebios' reading, not even mentioning Diels's conjecture *προσεπιθεάζειν*, which is an intelligent attempt to combine the intelligibility of Eusebios with something not too unlike the letters of the manuscripts. The translation is, as usual in France, clear and pleasant to

read, but once or twice it seems to have missed the meaning, as at 387 c, where he forgets that *πρόσληψις* means 'minor premiss', 387 f, where the participles *μέλλων* and *γενόμενος* are taken as referring to Eustrophos (they surely refer to Plutarch himself), 391 d, where *κόσμον αἰοδῆς*, if that is the true reading in the Orphic hexameter quoted, does not mean 'beau chant'. The commentary is slight, though good enough as far as it goes; one glaring omission is that of any discussion of the very difficult and textually uncertain passage 392 f (*ἐκθλίβεται . . . διωσάμενοι*), while just below, in 393 b, the words *ἡ δ' ἑτερότης . . . τοῦ μὴ ὄντος*, which incidentally are mis-

translated, deserved comment. A great many more parallel passages might have been at least indicated without making the book over-bulky, and the modern attempts to explain what the *EI* really stood for get somewhat casual treatment, pp. 16 ff.

But to have found time and thought for such studies at all in the France of 1941 was praiseworthy. The printer, it should be mentioned, has done his part well (I notice but two very trifling misprints), and the long interval between publication and notice is due to no wish of either the editors or the reviewer.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE BUDÉ HELIODORUS

Héliodore, *Les Éthiopiennes*. Texte établi par R. M. RATTENBURY et T. W. LUMB et traduit par J. MAILLON. Tome III. (Collection Budé.) Pp. vii+126. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 80 fr.

THE third volume of the *Aethiopica* (Books VIII–X) concludes the Budé edition of Heliodorus. This constitutes a very important contribution to the study of the best known of the Greek novelists, since it is the first serious critical edition of his work; it is based upon the study of no fewer than twenty-two manuscripts, the majority of which are here examined for the first time. However, the editors have not exhausted all the known manuscript sources (cf. vol. i, p. xxiv and n. 2, as well as A. Colonna, *Heliodori Aethiopica*, Rome 1938, pp. viii ff.). Of the twenty-two manuscripts used seven are really important, the oldest being Vaticanus 157 (V) of the eleventh century.

In the third volume the editors acknowledge (pp. v ff.) that A. Colonna might be right in maintaining that we have probably three families of Heliodorus manuscripts, and that the readings of C should not be exclusively preferred. Colonna's view, however, should not alter to any great extent the text of the first two volumes, which is based upon a sound and judicious choice of readings. These same qualities of dis-

cretion are apparent in the third volume—no mean achievement considering the fluid character of the Greek of the period and the author.

In the third volume there are changes in the manuscript tradition. C does not contain Books VIII, IX, and X, and B only contains Book VIII and part of IX (cf. vol. i, pp. xxxviii–xlii and lix–lx). To this is due the fact that while in the first two volumes (Books I–VII) the reading of a single manuscript (C or B) is sometimes held genuine against the agreement of all the rest (e.g. I. xix. 2, 3, *αὐτοῖς*; vi. iii. 3, 5 *ἐπέταξεν*; vi. viii. 5, 3 *μή*, etc.), in the third volume (Books VIII–X) the agreement of the majority of the manuscripts is generally considered a sufficient guarantee for the readings of the archetype.

The apparatus criticus is elaborate, and this is quite understandable in an edition which endeavours to place before scholars for the first time all the variant readings of the manuscripts. But even so, just as in the first two volumes (Books I–VII) the readings of manuscripts whose hyparchetypes are simultaneously given are superfluous, so in the third (Books VIII–X) the statement of all the *lectiones singulares*, even completely meaningless ones (e.g. viii. xii. 2, 1, or x. xxiii. 4, 2), or of orthographical errors (e.g. x. xxxix. 1, 5), and the occasional long discussion of textual

problems (e.g. x. xvi. 7, 7-8) together with the inclusion of explanatory suggestions (e.g. x. xxix. 2, 5-6) make the apparatus cumbersome. One would rather have seen such material included in an appendix.

There are a number of interesting conjectures and new readings introduced into the text, e.g. ἰὼ . . . δεδευμένου in VIII. viii. 1, 4 (supported by IX. xix. 2, 8), or <μῆ> in VIII. vi. 2, 5 (supported by Polyb. v. 25, 7), etc. But there are also conjectures which are unacceptable, as for instance ἀλλὰ <ἐκ> μόνου τοῦ πιστεύσαντος ἀναρτῶμενον in VIII. xvii. 4, 6, where the editors give a harsh construction and two emendations. If instead we alter μετασπώσης to μετασπούσης (from μεθέπω—poetic words are often used by later prose-writers), we can perhaps defend the text of our manuscripts: τὸ πιστὸν (object) τῆς εὐνοίας (subject) οὐ μετασπούσης, ἀλλὰ μόνον τοῦ πιστεύσαντος (sc. αὐτοῦς) ἀναρτῶσης: 'their goodwill not following attachment to children or relatives, but making them depend only on him (their master) who has shown them confidence'. Other examples are: τῇν <δᾶδα> κατὰ λυχνούχον ἐπιθείς in VIII. xii. 4, 6-7 (a torch (δᾶς) could never be put 'on' a λυχνούχος), and τὸν χαλινὸν τῷ ἵππῳ in IX. xv. 5, 4 instead of τῷ χαλινῷ τὸν ἵππον, which is supported by VIII. xvi. 5, 9, etc.

The notes accompanying the translation are exclusively by Mr. Rattenbury, with the exception of those attributed to M. Maillon (M.) which are generally platitudinous and unimpor-

tant. Mr. Rattenbury repeatedly expresses (vol. i, pp. xlix ff.; iii, p. vii) the recognition of his debt to Adamantios Coraes; but there are a number of important new notes of his own such as that on x. i. 1, 2, in which he convincingly supports the reading παρανείλον of MS. P in II. xxvi. 5, 3, etc.; there are others less acceptable, e.g. that on VIII. xi. 2, 5, which explains why the emendation χᾶ τ' of Lumb was adopted; χᾶ τ', as far as I know, is impossible Greek, and worse than the metrical error καὶ τ' ἀδόκητα of our manuscripts, which can be supported by the καὶ τὰ δοκητα of *Anth. Palat.* ix. 499, probably coming from another manuscript tradition. Metrical errors are after all not uncommon in later Greek.

The French translation of M. Maillon is hardly up to the standard of the text. In many passages it is much too free (e.g. VIII. xvi. 1, VIII. viii. 1, VIII. viii. 4), and occasionally it does not seem to follow the text given by the editors (e.g. VIII. xii. 4 'pose la lampe sur son support', where δᾶδα has been introduced into the text).

The printing of the book is good, with only a few unimportant typographical errors—a great achievement considering the conditions in which it appeared; the editors saw only one proof in 1940, and this they had to send back to the publishers through Switzerland, after the fall of France.

C. A. TRYPANIS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

NOTES ON THE GREEK ROMANCES

Albert WIFSTRAND: *Eikota. V. Zu den Romanschriftstellern*. Pp. 42. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse, 1944-45, II.) Lund: Gleerup, 1945. Paper.

THIS fascicule of Wifstrand's emendations and interpretations does not show him at his best. That is not to say that he does not make a number of good points; but most of his observations are on rather trivial matters, hardly worth printing in themselves, while his treatment of more serious difficulties is often far from convincing. He shows, as

usual, wide learning, but he is too much mesmerized by the magic of parallels, real or fancied; he fails to appreciate that a solitary example of an expression in one author is not proved to be genuine because the same or a similar expression may with certainty be attributed to another or to others. He has, for instance, little difficulty in demonstrating that Greek writers of the Roman period not infrequently used εἰς and the accusative where earlier writers would have used the dative without a preposition; but it does not follow that Helio-

dorus
the d
θανμα
Wifst
his an
not s
in an
dative
παρὰ
wholl
ibility
τίθεμ
that
does
not m
copy
Soph
Wifst
offers
taken
the a
indef
from
fied
A.D.
from
able
the
date
To
of th
Eph
no m
gests
punc
num
seem
in ch
trad
addr
lem.
Heli
they
trou
whe
tion
is p
pos
Tat.
dele
prec
the
γυν
littl
ii. 3

dorus, who is not sparing in his use of the dative, chose to write at i. 10. 4 ὁ θαυμαστός, φησι, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ νεανίας, and Wifstrand certainly does not strengthen his argument by citing v. 4. 5, which is not strictly parallel and where there is in any case good reason for avoiding a dative, or iv. 19. 4 (ὁ Θετταλός, ἔφην, καὶ παρὰ σοὶ θαυμαστός), which is almost wholly irrelevant. There is more plausibility in his defence of ταύτῃ τῇ γνώμῃ τίθεμαι at ii. 29. 1; but again the fact that this construction can be paralleled does not convince me that τῇ γνώμῃ has not replaced τὴν γνώμην by a natural copyist's mistake; the variants at Sophocles, *Phil.* 1448, are instructive. Wifstrand's treatment of Charito i. 13. 9 offers another example of the same mistaken tendency. He is able to show that the addition of a superfluous δέ to an indefinite relative, hitherto quoted only from very late Greek, can be exemplified in writers of the fourth century A.D.; this is interesting, but it is far from making it certain, or even probable, that Charito, for whom the end of the second century is the latest likely date, wrote λαβὲ τῶν σῶν εἴ τι δ' ἂν θέλῃς.

To the correction and interpretation of the texts of Charito, Xenophon of Ephesus, and Longus Wifstrand makes no noteworthy contribution. He suggests some possible improvements in punctuation and he calls attention to a number of passages where recent editors seem to have been too hasty, sometimes in changing, sometimes in accepting the traditional text; but very rarely does he address himself to an important problem. His notes on Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus are of more interest because they do include discussions of some troublesome passages; but I doubt whether many of the suggested solutions will find general acceptance. There is perhaps some plausibility in his proposal to read αὔχημα for ἀτύχημα at Ach. Tat. viii. 10. 9, accepting Mitscherlich's deletion of the words καὶ αὔχημα in the preceding clause, and to bracket εἰς in the phrase οἶαν εἰς ἐλέφαντα Λυδία βάπτει γυνή at Ach. Tat. i. 4. 3; but I can see little or no merit in his conjectures at ii. 36. 2 (ὥσπερ τοῦ κάλλους αἱ χορηγοὶ

θεαί), iii. 20. 6 (ἐν τῷ ναυαγίῳ καὶ for καὶ τῷ ναυαγίῳ), or viii. 8. 7 where he would add αὐρίον after λύεται. At iii. 21. 3 he wishes to alter the meaningless ὁ σίδηρος into ποδήρει, which seems to have less plausibility than any previous conjecture. This is a puzzling passage; I have yet to see a more tolerable correction than the ὅτι δεῖ which I wrote in the margin of my text some years ago, though I have not regarded it as worthy of publication.

Wifstrand's most acceptable suggestions in Heliodorus are at ii. 25. 3 (ὑποκριτὶς for ὑπόκρισις), ii. 26. 5 (ἀψ δάπεδον for αἶψα πέδον), and viii. 8. 1 (ἰψ for τψ). In the last, though he could not know it, he was anticipated by the editors of the Budé edition (vol. iii, 1943); the other two, though not so certain, will at least be worthy of places in the apparatus criticus of future editions. On the other hand, his treatment of i. 10. 4 (see above), ii. 11. 3, v. 20. 1, and ix. 18. 1 is far from satisfactory. In smaller matters he sometimes persuades me, but by no means always. In suggesting the exclusion of καὶ before τὸν νεών at i. 18. 4 he was forestalled by Coraes to whom, and not to Bekker, should also be ascribed the correction which he approves at v. 33. 5; I do not feel so certain as Wifstrand that either is right.

Wifstrand appends to his notes on the text of the *Aethiopica* some observations on the date of the author. Considerations of language and style persuade him that the fourth century is more probable than the third century, and he says that Professor M. P. Nilsson has reached the same conclusion on religious grounds. Few, I think, will judge that the evidence which he adduces is more conclusive than the evidence previously adduced for placing Heliodorus in the third century, and many will be surprised that a scholar who defends in Charito an idiom unexampled before the fourth century regards some of Heliodorus' much less striking linguistic idiosyncrasies as incompatible with an age earlier than the age in which they become common.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

HORACE REWRITTEN

Q. Horati Flacci *Carmina cum Epodis* edidit emendavit adnotavit A. Y. CAMPBELL. Pp. 212. Liverpool: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THIS edition of the *Odes and Epodes* by Professor Campbell consists of text and Latin commentary. It completes the work of which the editor gave us a first instalment in *Horati Carmina Viginti* (published in 1934 and reviewed in *C.R.* xlix), and the novel features of the earlier book persist in the full edition. The same combinations of *Odes* reappear although no further ones are added. Transpositions of lines and stanzas are also fairly numerous; of these at least two (I. xxviii. 17-18 and 19-20 transposed; IV. v. 25-8 placed after 16) seem distinctly attractive. Above all, we are presented—as the publishers justly claim—with a ‘radically revised text’ which embodies about 150 conjectures by earlier scholars and about 200 by Mr. Campbell himself. These conjectures—especially the latter—are discussed in some detail in the commentary, but unfortunately there is still no general explanation of the editor’s critical principles. Perhaps, however, this is one of the topics which he reserves for later treatment (‘habeo in animo . . . de ductu non litterarum solum sed uerborum atque etiam rerum, posthac amplius disceptare’).

The recognized *cruces* are in the main dismissed summarily. Twice there is no note where we expect one (I. iv. 8 *visit-urit*, and I. vii. 27 *Teucro-Teucro*); and in general Mr. Campbell is content to select, with little or no comment, one of the solutions which have been previously proposed. Thus he adopts Faber’s *Marsi* I. ii. 39; Atterbury’s *aemulo* I. vi. 2; Hamacher’s *catenis nobilitatum* | *Regulum* I. xii. 35 (despite the bad rhythm); Schütz’s *potabo*, preceded by a lacuna (as Mueller suggested), I. xx. 1; Bentley’s *vepris ad ventum* (combining Gogau and Muretus) I. xxiii. 5; the Aldine readings *Euro* I. xxv. 20 and *laboras in* I. xxvii. 19; Palmer’s *devia scitam* II. xi. 21, and Bentley’s *incomptam . . . comam . . . nodo* ib. 23-4; Lachmann’s *Thynus* II.

xiii. 15; Palmer’s *limina vilicae* III. iv. 10; Gesner’s *effluatque* III. xi. 18; Gow’s *expectate* III. xiv. 11; and Palmer’s *sub-lis* III. xxiv. 4 and *dotium* IV. xiii. 21. Occasionally, however, Mr. Campbell offers an original solution, e.g. I. xxxii. 15 *fi bilinguis* (for *cumque salve*).—I. xxxvii. 24 *trepidavit Aras*, citing Virg. *Aen.* I. 109 for the proper name and adding ‘locus conclamatus: et historiae et contextui primus satisfacio’.—II. iii. 11 *ramique et obliquo laborans* | *lymphā fugax crepitare rivo*. As *lymphā* now becomes one of the subjects of *umbram consociare*, his comment ‘sententiam transformavi’ is not unjustified.—II. xix. 28 *pacis eras meritisque belli*, where *meritis* seems still more difficult than *medius* of the manuscripts.—II. xx. 6 *quem vocas* | *tu ‘docte’, Maecenas*, which is open to the same objections as ‘*dilecte*’, *Maecenas*.—III. xxvi. 6 *hic ponite ludicra*, | *funalia et vectis catervae* | *oppositis foribus minacis*.—At IV. viii. 15 ff. two lines are inserted to remove the apparent confusion between the elder and the younger Scipio and at the same time make the *Ode* conform to Meineke’s Canon. As reconstructed the passage reads . . . *non celeres fugae rei-claeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae*, | *maior Scipiadum quam sibi gloriam*, | *non incendia Karthaginis impiae*, | *maiores peperit quam sibi iunior* | *heros qui domita*, etc.—*Epod.* ix. 25 *neque Africani tam superbam paginam* | *virtus sepulchro contulit*. The least unconvincing of his conjectures seem to be:—I. xii. 31 *et, minax ni sic voluere*, i.e. ‘the wave that would threaten unless they have willed that there be a calm’: manuscripts read *quod, qui, quia*.—II. xviii. 29 ff. *nulla certior tamen* | *capaciorve sede destinata* | *aula . . .* This gives good sense and a smooth construction, though it does not account for the manuscript reading *fine*.—IV. ii. 49 *nosque, dum procedit* (sc. *Augustus*), ‘*io Triumphe!*’ | *te simul dicemus . . .* *Te* is ablative with *simul*, and an accidental transposition of the initial syllables of the two lines is assumed.

In the above instances there is a

genera
Mr. C
lenge
emen
sages
had n
in con
is less
editor
is giv
a fai
inult
| te
gesta
Priar
castr
parte
temp
ta) |
man
revis
prae
corn
corp
pavi
69 t
Gyas
—II
mat
cui
man
(et q
| reg
hum
iam
sup
exu
Car
unf
by
exe

Ap
é
P
V
3
3
IN
all
Ap

generally acknowledged difficulty, and Mr. Campbell has not shirked the challenge to find a solution. Most of his emendations, however, are made in passages where the soundness of the text had not normally been suspected; and in consequence his *cacoethes emendandi* is less restrained by the work of earlier editors. The following selection, which is given without comment, will provide a fair sample:—I. ii. 51 *Medos agitare inultos | undique calcar (equitare inultos, | te duce, Caesar)*.—I. viii. 10 *livida gestat ansis (armis) | braccia*.—I. x. 15 *Priamus . . . iniqua tranans (Troiae) | castra*.—I. xiii. 16 *gutta sparsa (quinta parte) sui nectaris*.—I. xvi. 23 *pectoris | temptavit ulcisci iubentis (in dulci iuventa) | fervor*.—I. xxxi. 14 *ter et quater | mannos revisens aequore ab Africo (anno revisens aequor Atlanticum)*.—I. xxxv. 2 *praesens vel icti tollere de gradu | frontale cornu (vel imo tollere de gradu | mortale corpus)*.—II. xiv. 27 *et mero | tinguet pavimentum spuendo (superbo)*.—III. iv. 69 *testis negatam (mearum) centimanus Gyas | scandens in arcem (sententiarum)*.—III. xiv. 9 *vos, senum matres (virginum matres)*.—III. xxiii. 17 *immundus aram cui tetigit canis (immunis aram si tetigit manus)*.—III. xxx. 11 *qua per pauperem (et qua pauper) aquae Daunus agrestium | regnavit populum, ortu (populorum) ex humili potens*.—Ib. 14 *Musa, superne iam | quaesita meritis tu mihi . . . (sume superbiam | quaesitam meritis et mihi . . .)*.—*Epod.* viii. 8 *hirquinaque ala exuberans (equina quales ubera)*. Mr. Campbell has a certain partiality for unfamiliar words: thus *ales* is replaced by *caeles* I. ii. 42; *umor* by *luror* I. xiii. 6; *exercitus* by *exoticus* I. xvi. 21; and

militaris Daunias by *limitaris Dauniae* I. xxii. 13. He also cannot tolerate the well-attested licence of lengthening *-et* and *-it* in arsis, and therefore emends in every case: e.g. in I. iii. 36 *perrupit Acheronta* becomes *perrupit Stygium amnem*, and the familiar words of II. vi. 13 appear as *ille terrarum est mihi praeter omnis | angulus ridens, ubi . . .*

Mr. Campbell seems to have modelled his critical methods upon those of Bentley and Peirlkamp, but even their more daring efforts appear tame by comparison. He is, indeed, well aware that emendations should be tested by the so-called laws of intrinsic and transcriptional probability, and in his commentary he is at pains to apply them: nevertheless few of his suggestions are convincingly Horatian, while his palaeographical explanations too often leave us with the feeling that anything can be changed into anything. Perhaps the source of the trouble is a false hypothesis; for a 'radically revised text' implies a widespread and deep-seated corruption of the manuscript tradition, and of this there is no satisfying evidence.

Mr. Campbell has deserved well of Horatians by his stimulating literary criticism in his *Horace: A New Interpretation*, but it is doubtful whether the present work will enhance his reputation. Indeed, we feel confident that if he had taken his poet's advice and locked away his edition for nine years after completion, he would himself have hesitated to publish it except in a radically revised form.

T. E. WRIGHT.

The Queen's College, Oxford.

THE BUDÉ APULEIUS

Apulée: *Les Métamorphoses*. Texte établi par D. S. ROBERTSON et traduit par Paul VALLETTE. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres. Paper; Vol. I (livres i-iii), pp. lxii + 85, 1940, 30 fr.; Vol. II (livres iv-vi), pp. 101, 1940, 30 fr.; Vol. III (livres vii-xi), pp. 170, 1945, 150 fr.

IN 1849 H. Keil expressed the view that all the manuscripts of the *Metam.* of Apuleius he had seen in Italy were

derived from F (*Laurentianus* 68. 2, saec. xi, written at Monte Cassino); this opinion is now accepted as valid for all known manuscripts of *Metam.* Unhappily F is defaced by numerous erasures and corrections; of the latter few are due to the original scribe and many are simply misguided attempts to bring F into line with its least trustworthy descendants.

The first task of an editor, then, is to

ascertain what in fact the scribe of F did write. R. Helm's first edition (1907), based on his own collation, was a noteworthy advance in our knowledge of F; but his editions of 1913 and 1931 add no more first-hand information. C. Giarratano collated F again, and in his edition (1929) corrected Helm's report at many points. We now have a third witness in Professor Robertson, who has studied the whole of F at various times. Except for such details as the indiscriminate use of *e* and *ε* (for *e*, *ae*, or *oe*) and the confusion of *b* and *v*, the apparatus of this latest edition affords the reader full opportunity of learning what can be read in F. When Robertson silently makes a decision between Helm and Giarratano his opinion can be taken as authoritative; where he disagrees with both, the fact is punctiliously indicated. This painstaking record of F makes it highly unlikely that further work on the manuscript would produce any worthwhile result.

An editor's second task is to determine what light the other manuscripts throw on the original readings of F. Already in 1924 Robertson had published the results of his study of the later manuscripts in two important articles (*C.Q.* xviii. 27-42, 85-99); his conclusions were largely accepted by Giarratano and influenced Helm's third edition. The oldest extant copy of F is ϕ , written at Monte Cassino about A.D. 1200 after folio 160 of F had been torn. Somewhat carelessly produced in the first instance, ϕ itself has also suffered many corrections. Apart from ϕ , there are four classes of later manuscripts. Robertson has shown that only ϕ and Class I have real importance; but whereas Helm in his apparatus cites all manuscripts except F and ϕ under a common symbol and Giarratano quotes only one manuscript of Class I separately, Robertson records the pertinent readings of all the four chief manuscripts of Class I. His apparatus therefore is to be welcomed as the fullest and clearest picture we have of the manuscript evidence and as a conspicuous advance on earlier work.

Knowledge of the original readings of

F, however, is only a preliminary; an editor's crucial task is to decide how far F represented what Apuleius wrote and how its innumerable deficiencies are to be remedied. Scribes and correctors of the later manuscripts tried to amend the more glaring defects in the tradition, and more recent scholars and editors have been profuse in suggestions. Amidst the jumble Professor Robertson exercises a cool judgement based on a wide knowledge of the other works of Apuleius (cf. e.g. the note on *primam* <ferme>, iii. 21) and on a sound appreciation of the divergences between classical and later Latin.

In general he is no more wedded to F than are Helm and Giarratano, and his comment on defences of F is more often *frustra* than *recte*; yet at i. 7 he alone retains the difficult *dicacitas timida*, at ii. 17 he accepts Weyman's support of *sensim* (against Bursian's *sessim*), and at vii. 14 (*habitura*) and viii. 16 (*necquicquam frustra*) he welcomes Löfstedt's arguments. His apparatus is not so liberal in the mention of rejected emendations as are those of Helm and Giarratano, and it may be presumed that his silence is not always due to lack of space. Naturally his choice amongst proffered improvements is not infrequently different from both Helm's and Giarratano's. I have the impression that in the more really serious *cruces* he more often sides with Giarratano than with Helm. He is almost certainly right in following Vallette at i. 2 (<*emensus*> *emersi*), Gaselee at i. 18 (*spongia* <*ubi*>), Walter at iii. 19 (*adrisi*), Colvius at iv. 27 (*languore*), Castiglioni at v. i (*domi*), Bursian at v. 17 (*turbata uigiliis*), ϕ at vi. 4 (*profugos*), Helm's first edition at viii. 26 (*fracta et rauca*), and A. Y. Campbell's cluster of suggestions at viii. 8. I confess to some regret that he has rejected Traube's *don* <*is orn*> *are* at v. 6, Damsté's *pauculum* (for *poculum*) at x. 7, and Kaibel's *Osiriacam* at xi. 24 (which Giarratano accepts).

Professor Robertson incorporates in his text some fifty-five of his own emendations. Mention can here be made of only a few. *Accumbentem* at i. 22 is well founded on Apuleian usage; *hercules* <*est*> *Lucius* at ii. 2 is nearer F; the

insertion of <necessitati> at ii. 28 is better than Rohde's <fato>; <istarum> at iii. 19 is better supported than Cornelissen's <earum>; <nominis> for <numinis> at iv. 30 is admirable; <sulcatum trahens gressum> is a much neater correction of F than any previously made; <Charon ille Ditis exactor> at vi. 18 finally cures a crux; <Ioue irato> at vii. 6 is superior to Haupt's <deo meo irato> and certainly to Helm's <eo fato>; <ultis> at vii. 9 gives a point which the <aliis> of F obscured; <elidentes> for <libentes> at vii. 10 eliminates an exception to Apuleian usage; at viii. 22 <luxurie sua> is better than the <uxori suae> which editors, relying on ϕ , extract from F's garbled reading; <et ignes> at ix. 1 for the <gen(us)> of F is well supported by parallels; F's <(mortem) uiolentam defamem> at ix. 17 is rightly suspected and neatly changed to <lentam de fame>; <publica(ns pudicitia)m> at x. 23 is virtually proved by the context; <cursu memet> for F's <cursu> at x. 35 is excellent, as is <Actaeam Cererem> for F's <deam Cer.> at xi. 5.

Here and there I find Robertson less convincing. For example, at iv. 8, where F has <semiferis Lapithis tebcinib(us) centaurisq(ue)>, it cannot be a final solution to read <[tebcinibus] centaurisque> <(semihominibus)>; <inquieta animi> at vi. 1 for <inq. animo> of F seems needless; despite Robertson's <fugata est a mea pernicie> at vii. 28, a good case could still be made out for F's <fug. est a me pernicie(s)>; and F's <plagosa crura uulnera contegenti> at viii. 5 is only patched up by <plagoso ac frustra uul. cont.>.

In the apparatus Robertson offers some thirty-five other suggestions. Of these <cule tenus> for <actenus> at iii. 20, <uepre obsitae> for <repositae> at iv. 6, and <nocte diuque> for <diutius> at v. 23 are the most attractive.

All in all, Robertson's sheaf of emendations and suggestions are a considerable contribution to the soundness of a badly corrupted text; they merit respect not only because they come from a judicious scholar who is steeped in his author, but also for their intrinsic excellence.

A special word of praise must be added for the apparatus itself which, considering its limited extent, gives a remarkable amount of well-arranged in-

formation. The symbols and abbreviations are never confusing. Some of the notes (e.g. ii. 16 on <fluente>, v. 12 on <punctulo>, viii. 12 on <sepulchrum>, and ix. 6 on <fallaciosae>) are models of arguments in miniature. Again and again one notices that Helm's or Giarratano's mistaken attributions of emendations to earlier scholars have been silently corrected.

M. Vallette, who had previously edited the <Apologia> and <Florida> in the same series, contributes part of the Introduction, the translation, and some brief notes on points of interpretation and mythology. Vallette's Introduction gives a good survey of the sources of the <Metam.>, its structure, and its relation to Lucian; but the appreciation of the style is confined to a single page and it is surprising that little or nothing is said about the language and diction. Robertson's account of the manuscripts (pp. xxxviii-lv) is a brilliantly lucid piece of exposition, far in advance of Giarratano's. A sound bibliography follows the Introduction.

The translation strikes me as a very skilful effort which, while faithfully following the new text, does not neglect the spirit of solemn persiflage which characterizes this fantastic tale. At the same time it brings into sharp contrast the diverse excellences of the two languages. So, for example, <occidemoriturus> becomes <frappe à mort comme qui doit mourir>; and <talis illa mulier miro me persequabatur odio> becomes <telle que je l'ai décrite, cette femme me poursuivait d'une haine inimaginable>. To an English reader this easy lightness of touch seems scarcely a fair exchange for the planned solidity of Apuleius' diction.

Scholars may well congratulate themselves as well as Professors Robertson and Vallette that this very scholarly and elegant edition has safely survived the disruptions of war; it contains the ripe fruit of many years of patient learning which we could ill have afforded to lose. The printing and proof-reading have also been astonishingly well done: the only real grumble I have is that <liber viii> is used in the running title instead of <liber ix>.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

University of Liverpool.

THE BUDÉ PRUDENTIUS

Prudence. Tome II: *Apothéosis, Hamartigénie*. Texte établi et traduit par M. LAVARENNE. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xix+156. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper, 70 fr.

THIS second instalment brings us to the doctrinal poems. The Introduction gives a brief sketch of Latin didactic poetry, designed to show that Prudentius was working in a well-established tradition; then follow some short and sensible remarks on two vexed questions, whether he borrowed his arguments from Tertullian and why, like Juvenal, he chose to attack figures from the past; then some necessary information about the heresiarchs with whom we are concerned.

The text shows only one serious departure from Bergman; but there are some changes of punctuation, not indeed always for the better, but certainly so at *Apoth.* 592, where Obbar and Dressel make the sentence unintelligible and Bergman leaves *norat* (593) without a construction. At *Apoth.* 548 a reading which seems to me to be definitely wrong has been accepted from Bergman. The passage refers to the fate of the Jews, who, having been false to their inheritance, are now subject to Rome, which has become Christian:

seruit ab antiquis dilapsa fidelibus heres
nobilitas, sed iam non nobilis; illa recentem
susceplat captiua fidem.

Dressel read *suspectat*, but Bergman restored *susceplat*, the reading of the sixth-century MS. A. (It appears also in two of his tenth-century MSS.) Lavarenne translates *illa recentem* etc. thus: 'au contraire ceux qui étaient jadis captifs adoptent la foi nouvelle'. He introduces 'au contraire' because he has to make *illa (nobilitas) captiua* mean the Romans, which it cannot do; nor can *illa captiua* mean 'ceux qui étaient jadis captifs'. A is by no means impeccable, and here *suspectat*, which is the reading of B (seventh-century) and all Bergman's other manuscripts except those mentioned above, must be right. The Jews now 'look up to', i.e. find themselves in subjection to, the new

faith. There is a similar use of *suspiciit* in *Cath.* 3. 130 *sic coluber muliebre solum | suspiciit atque uirum mulier*, which Lavarenne renders 'ainsi le serpent se voit dominé par le pied de la femme'. There need be no difficulty in giving the same sense to the frequentative verb, a type which is common in Prudentius. The major departure from Bergman to which I referred is in the *Hamartigenia*, where Lavarenne transfers lines 887-91 to follow 930, on the ground that in their traditional place they interrupt the argument. This is a hazardous thing to do in the face of all the manuscripts and in an author who is apt to be discursive. It may be that Prudentius ought to have placed these lines after 930, but this would be no proof that he did so. But indeed the lines are not precisely apposite at either place. It is true that lines 892-930 enlarge on a theme which has been discussed already in 863-91 and might have been brought to an end there, but Prudentius has a fresh inspiration and goes on again.

The translation, as before, is both readable and generally faithful, but there is more scope than in the former volume for disputing the rendering. I mention a few instances. At *Apoth.* 497 a member of Julian's guard *gemino gemmata hastilia ferro proicit*: 'son javelot au double fer'. Was there such a weapon? Auxiliaries did sometimes carry two spears; there is an illustration in Daremberg-Saglio III. i. 39. *Ham.* 100 *perituros mactat honores*: 'sacrifices sanglants'. Surely 'sacrifices that will be wasted'. At *Ham.* 115 the Marcionite creator (who is also the author of evil)

anguino medicans noua semina suco
rerum principium mortis de fomite traxit:

'il a pris au feu de la mort l'étincelle avec laquelle il donna la vie au monde'. This distorts the sense; *mortis fomite* is the material which gives rise to death; cf. *Ham.* 557 *ille quidem fomes nostrorum et causa malorum est*. *Ham.* 597 (in the famous passage about the breeding habits of vipers) *aestuat interno pietatis crimine mater* cannot mean 'est plongée

dans l'angoisse par le crime qu'en ses entrailles vont commettre ses enfants, *objets de son amour*'. It might be the crime committed in the name of filial piety, for the young vipers avenge the murder of their sire by killing their dam. Lavarenne thinks this interpretation is far-fetched and that there is nothing in the context to support it; but the words which follow (*carnificemque gemit, damnati conscia sexus, [progeniem]*) seem to me much in its favour. Perhaps, however, the meaning is 'the outrage against filial duty'; cf. Prop. i. 11. 30 a, *percant Baiae, crimen Amoris, aquae*, and Stat. *Ach.* ii. 331. At any rate Lavarenne is too prosaic in rendering *damnati conscia sexus* by 'comme elle sait que son organe de la parturition ne peut s'ouvrir'. At *Ham.* 910 the apocalyptic vision of St. John is introduced as an instance of the soul's power to penetrate both space and time with its sight:

sic arcana uidet tacitis cooperta futuris
corporeus Iohannis adhuc nec carne solutus,
munere sed somni paulisper carne sequestra
liber ad intuitum, etc.

Lavarenne accepts the view that *sequestra* here = *sequestrata*: 'pendant qu'il dormait, il laissa cette chair de côté pendant quelques instants'. This view is both unsupported elsewhere and

uncalled-for here. The meaning is that the grace of sleep, whereby the soul is set free to gaze, comes through the intermediary of the body. Stam in his edition of the poem (Amsterdam, 1940) rightly rejects *sequestra* = *sequestrata*, but couples the word with *liber* ('free from the mediation of the flesh', i.e. from the necessity of looking through the bodily eyes); but the examples he quotes provide no parallel for this kind of mediation, nor do I think one could be found.

At the end of the book are a few pages of notes for which there was no room under the text. On *Ham.* 784 it is pointed out that there is no scriptural authority for making Goliath a descendant of Orpah. True, but in rabbinical tradition she figures as his mother (*Midrash Rabbah*, ed. Freedman and Simon, vol. Ruth, p. 38; also Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, iv. 31). It is interesting to find such extra-scriptural tradition known to Prudentius.

At *Ham.* 270 *uirides* has dropped out of the text after *gravidis*.

I have dwelt on disagreements, but there is much that is admirable in this volume.

H. J. THOMSON.

University College, Bangor.

THE COINAGE OF SICILIAN NAXOS

Herbert A. CAHN: *Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos*. (Basler Studien zur Kunstgeschichte, Band II.) Pp. 168; 12 plates. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1944. Paper, 9 Sw. fr.

THE author of this scholarly publication is to be congratulated for the excellence of his work and felicitated on his choice of subject, for Sicilian Naxos is justly famed for having minted some of the most perfect of all coins.

Since the 1880's a special technique has gradually been evolved for handling the surviving material from any Greek mint, and this for the industrious scholar must always be founded upon the slow discipline of careful cataloguing and collating. In the present case the actual material was only 150 different coins, represented by a total of 651

specimens which have been catalogued by Cahn with precision in 44 pages.

A careful chapter on the metrology of the Naxian coins, on their relation to other Sicilian coins, and on their economic significance precedes the catalogue. Frequency tables have been employed with good effect in this section.

The historian and art-lover will, however, find the highest value in the first seventy-odd pages wherein the coins are described and appraised; for not only can careful study such as this add something to our meagre knowledge of the city's history, but it can also increase our regard for its art.

Cahn classes the coins in six groups, of which the first is dated 550-530 B.C., and the last around 403, when the city was destroyed. His arguments for grouping

and dating cannot evoke any serious challenge, nor can his criticism of the varying merits in the work of the numerous engravers who cut dies for Sicilian Naxos. The most brilliant and gifted of all die-cutters, whom I have elsewhere called the Aetna-Master, made dies for Naxos, and Cahn agrees (p. 49) in ascribing to him at least five of the six dies which I believe him to have made—two for Aetna, two for Catana, and two for Naxos. It is no exaggeration when Cahn describes him as 'the Olympia-Master' of die-engraving.

So just an appreciation might perhaps have led the author to revise certain earlier remarks which he made (p. 7) on the art of die-sinking. He is resigned to its being classed with the *artes minores*, only because our ancient sources do not draw it into the magic circle of their arbitrary aesthetic. But who in these days really cares for Plinian, or kindred, pomposities of judgement?

The artists whom Greeks before the Hellenistic age held in high esteem were always those whose *métier* was *τορευτική*. Wace's brilliant essay of 1935 on this subject has recently been reinforced by work of Miss Richter's (*A.J.A.* 1941, pp. 363 ff.). Kalamis, Myron, Pheidias, and Polykleitos—each of them was primarily a *τορευτής* and therefore made his great name; and it is certain that some of the most distinguished turned their hands at times to both gem-engraving and die-sinking. Of such were the Sicilians, Kimon, Euainetos, Herakleidas, and numerous others whose reputation was great enough to permit the appearance of their signatures upon the coinage of the State. Such men in the opinion of their own countrymen stood very high above the nameless masons who worked on the sculptural decoration of temples. No slave, but only free-born citizens, might be taught the elegant art of the metal-chaser (see Gisela Richter, loc. cit., p. 379).

Here is the explanation of the amazing quality of Greek engraving, which earned the appreciation of so many Greeks, not least among them the people of Naxos.

The engraver who should deserve the

name of 'Naxos-Master' is perhaps that original artist who made the first archaic dies about 550 B.C. and whose work is akin to that of the Amasis painter in Athens. But the engraver, whose work is of a more definitely Ionian character than the work of the Athenian, was surely the greater artist of the two. He established a manner of presenting Dionysos *Meilichios* which was followed by at least five other die-sinkers whose work continued until 490 B.C., when Naxos became subject to Hippokrates of Gela. Nearly thirty years elapsed before the city's restoration in 461, a great event which, it seems, was celebrated by the issue of that most magnificent of tetradrachms, the famous coin with the head of Dionysos and the figure of the squatting Seilenos. This masterpiece, which must be by the hand of the Aetna-Master, must have been produced from dies of exceptional hardness. Cahn has been able to record no less than fifty-six specimens of this coin, all of them from the one pair of dies.

The next issue of tetradrachms is dated to the decade between 430 and 420 B.C. and represents an art which is rightly regarded as of Parthenonic character. The author's suggestion (p. 58) that these may be the work of Herakleidas, who made a number of dies at Catana, is very attractive, since there is a strong similarity of style.

The last important period in the history of Naxos, between 420 and 403 B.C., is represented by tetradrachms from one pair of dies and by a series of didrachms and smaller coins. On the didrachms the head of Dionysos gives place to that of Apollo Archegetes. A number of these minted between 415 and 405 bear the engraver's signature, Prokles, which was also the name of a statesman who controlled the affairs of Naxos and proved to be the collaborator who betrayed the state to Dionysius of Syracuse. Cahn (p. 61) has some doubts as to whether statesman and engraver are one and the same person, remarking that it would be unusual for a die-sinker to rise to so high a position. But this is only because so few histor-

ians
to c
rope
disti
Th
book
them
tions
thre
pain
comp

Allan
gis
He
the
Ma
36
log
Sk
un
Ma
An
sch
ios

THE A
dam
its a
forme
house
bank
the E
had b
ciples
chose
ampl
phase
ing e
inter
in loc
of wo
other
it sho
of its
archit
ander
Bissin
jects
impor
of con
major
curios.

ians have realized that it was possible to combine the artistic activities of a *ropevrijs* with a position of honour and distinction in one's city.

The twelve plates at the end of the book are exceedingly good. Over six of them present the varied die-combinations in chronological order, and on three plates details of ancient vase-painting and sculpture are shown for comparison with the coins. The last

plate of all shows pictures of some of the finest Naxian dies enlarged; and this, better than anything, enables the art critic to appreciate the magnificence of the city's coinage. We may have long to wait before there is published another work of such excellence on the products of a Greek mint.

CHARLES SELTMAN.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

THE ALLARD PIERSON MUSEUM

Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bydragen. VII. Hendrika C. VAN GULIK: *Catalogue of the Bronzes in the Allard Pierson Museum*, Part One. Pp. xvi+115; 36 plates. XI: C. S. PONGER: *Katalog der griechischen und römischen Skulptur, der steinernen Gegenstände und der Stuckplastik im Allard Pierson Museum*. Pp. xvi+103; 42 plates. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Mij., 1940, 1942. Paper, 10s., 13s.

THE Allard Pierson Museum of Amsterdam University acquired the bulk of its antiquities at the break-up of a former museum at The Hague which housed the private collections of the banker Scheurleer and of Von Bissing, the Egyptologist. These two collections had been formed on very different principles. The Scheurleer pieces are well chosen though generally mediocre examples representative of almost all phases of Greek and Roman art, pleasing enough but of little archaeological interest apart from a series of carvings in local stone from Tarentum; this class of work is scarcely represented in any other museum outside south Italy, and it shows that Magna Graecia had a style of its own in sculpture, and still more in architecture, between the time of Alexander and the Roman annexation. Von Bissing, on the contrary, selected objects primarily for their archaeological importance; some, as it happened, are of considerable artistic merit, but the majority can fairly be described as curios. He bought mainly from antique-

dealers in Egypt, and was particularly interested in the Graeco-Roman period, to which few collectors or museum curators have paid much attention. Other European museums have finer individual exhibits of the period, but none displays a wider range of objects so provocative of thought about that strange mixed culture and the obscurities of its religious syncretism.

The Allard Pierson Museum issued an excellent illustrated guide (*Algemeene Gids*) in 1937, and many of the objects had already been published, especially by Von Bissing; his articles, however, have to a large extent remained out of sight from classical scholars amid the literature of Egyptology. Consequently the appearance of a full-scale, documented catalogue, with a photograph of practically every object, is to be welcomed as an event of wider concern than is normally the case with a small and recently formed museum. The two volumes that have now reached this country are only the first instalments, but they deal with the most important sections of the museum. They cover the sculpture and architectural fragments and other work in stone or stucco, and the bronze statuettes and ornaments, including mirrors, so far as this material is of classical interest; the earlier Egyptian antiquities are held over for separate publication. The existence of the guide-book and of previous studies of the more outstanding pieces made it feasible to entrust the writing of the catalogue to doctorate candidates, each being assigned a part of the collections

large enough for a dissertation that makes a volume. The practice of using beginners for cataloguing has its familiar dangers and drawbacks, but these were reduced by the supervision of the Director, G. A. S. Snyder.

The volume on bronzes, at any rate, is extremely successful. Miss Van Gulik began it before the war and did some work in London, so that she had opportunities of drawing comparisons. She reveals enthusiasm for the subject, has thought about it and understands it; the documentation is good, and she follows up side-trails thoroughly. She introduces the Graeco-Egyptian bronzes with a valuable summary of the cults represented, and when she expresses original views they are well worth consideration. For instance, her dating of the life-size head from Aphrodisias, late in the tetrarchy of the Empire, seems more reasonable from the photographs (pl. xxiii) than the previous ascription to Gallienus' reign.

The volume on stone and stucco has suffered more obviously from the war, and in a variety of ways. The items are discussed in what appears, by comparison, a somewhat perfunctory manner, and the results of enforced isolation may be traceable in a lack of independent judgement, coupled with a tendency to unduly precise assertion where experi-

ence would have dictated hesitancy. Inability to use libraries elsewhere than in Amsterdam is probably reflected in faulty documentation; otherwise the Olynthus report would surely have been cited for evidence that the table-support, No. 165, is of a type that goes back to 400 B.C. But, at the best, second-hand knowledge from books could not supply adequate equipment for classifying some of these objects, which present unusual difficulties. This applies most noticeably to certain sculptures alleged to have been found at Naucratis; No. 15 is dogmatically ascribed to the beginning of the sixth century and No. 18 to its latter half, whereas I should guess that both of these, and No. 19, are Ptolemaic. In a number of other contexts the dating seems rather on the early side, but the poor quality of the plates hinders criticism—in particular, the illustration for No. 95 would be inexcusable in ordinary circumstances. But where Mr. Ponger was not unfairly handicapped he makes a better showing, as in his novel treatment of some limestone models of Macedonian helmets and shields and Persian caps, which he convincingly interprets as lasts for the leather armour of Ptolemaic mercenaries.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

WHEAT IN ANTIQUITY

Naum JASNY: *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity*. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXII, No. 3.) Pp. 176; 2 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. Paper, \$1.75.

It is hard to say how much Mr. Naum Jasny has added of his own, but he has dealt faithfully with a difficult subject and the classical student has much to learn from his book. The botanists have enlarged, but not yet simplified, the question. The Wheats have been reclassified (on the recondite basis of their chromosome-constitution), by Schultz and others, into three groups, to which Einkorn, Emmer, and Common Wheat,

with their host of varieties, belong. Vavilov has tried, more or less successfully, to trace the several kinds to their original homes. Elizabeth Schiermann and several others have studied the prehistoric wheats of the Neolithic and Bronze ages. Professor John Perceval has written his monograph on *The Wheat Plant*; and he and other agriculturists have helped to show how much can be elucidated from the brief allusions of Pliny, Cato, Columella, and the rest.

In the *Companion to Greek Studies* (1931) Thiselton Dyer pointed out, to the surprise of many, that 'Spelt' was 'a comparatively modern grain', un-

known to the Greeks, and first mentioned in Latin in the Edict of Diocletian; whereas scholars, translating *far* by 'spelt', had thought of it as of remote antiquity and as the staple diet of ancient Italy. The oldest of the cultivated wheats was Einkorn (*Tr. monococcum*), the Gk. *τίφη*, the *ζεὰ ἀπλή* of Dioscorides. It suits a poor soil; it makes wholesome porridge, but unsatisfactory bread; it was no crop for the rich wheat-lands of Italy or Egypt. Emmer, in its several varieties, was the staple wheat of classical agriculture; and here we come to another basis of classification. Each main group includes 'naked wheats' and 'hulled wheats' (*blés vêtus*), in which latter the grains are tightly enclosed in their chaffy 'hulls' or glumes (*ἐν χιτῶσι πολλοῖς ἢ γυμνόν*, Thphr.), and the whole ear is apt to break up into bits, or spikelets, before the glumes give way. *Far* is just such a wheat, and *far* (in the strict sense) is in fact the typical Emmer (*Tr. dicoccum*). It is identical with *ador*, *adoreum*. It is the Gk. *ζεῖα*, the *ζεῖα δίκωκκος* of Dioscorides, the *μικρὸς πυρὸς* of Galen, called also *ὄλυρα*; which last, like *τράγος*, meant especially the grain after the hulls had been removed. *Χόνδρος* meant the groats made from it, and *alica* was the Latin thereof. In short, *ζεῖα*, *ὄλυρα*, and *τίφη* were none of them naked wheats, but were all *πολυχίτωνες*, or *πολύλοποι* (Thphr. *C.P.* iv. 6. 3; *H.P.* viii. 4. 1). Emmer of one kind or another was grown in Egypt for thousands of years; it was the hulled wheat of Babylon, Assyria, and Palestine, and the *kussemeth* (קִסְמֶת) of the O.T. (Exod. ix. 32; Isa. xxviii. 25), rendered 'spelt' in the R.V. Dyer took *kussemeth* to be Einkorn, but this was little likely to be grown on the rich cornlands of Mesopotamia and Palestine. In course of time naked wheats came in, and all but supplanted the old hulled Emmer and Einkorn before the end of the classical period. But for the most part they were not such wheats as ours, but were rather naked varieties of the old Emmer; and the best of these, the so-called *durum*, is the 'macaroni wheat' of to-day, and was the most valu-

able wheat of classical antiquity. It was the staple wheat of later Egypt, and still predominates in Egypt and North Africa; it gives nearly half the wheat-crop in Greece and southern Italy, and in Sicily and Palestine little else is grown. Most emmers are bearded and their grains or kernels are hard, those of *durum* especially so; they are yellow, like ivory or like amber, and make good porridge, or semolina, or macaroni best of all; the straw is firm and solid, and plaits well, but 'common wheat' makes much better bread. Porridge and gruel and macaroni are older foods than bread, and the fine white starchy loaf savours of decadent luxury.

We come now to a few hard words. Galen and Oribasius describe *σεμίδαλις* as a hard, yellowish, very nutritious wheat; Dioscorides says the best wheat was yellow as a quince, and Pliny says the best wheat was *similago* from Africa. All of these were *durum*-wheats. Some *durum*-wheats are black-awned, and the *σίτος μελανθήρ* of the *Geoponica* was one of these. Another wheat of the Emmer group is Rivet or Poulard, a bearded wheat with large ears, of poorish quality, but a heavy cropper. A variety of it has branching ears; this (and not *millet*, as L. and S. say) is the branching *σινάβας* or *κριθαβίας* of Theophrastus (*H.P.* viii. 2. 3). Pliny's *tritium ramosum*; it is the *blé miracle* of the French, the wheat of Joseph's dream, when 'behold, seven ears came up on one stalk, full and good'. According to MM. Cotte, the Libyan varieties called *δρακοντίας*, *στραγγίας*, *σελινούσιος*, *καρχυδίας*, were all poulards; and *tritium*, in its narrow and technical sense, seems also to have been poulard.

Siligo was too soft for *durum*, too fine for poulard; it belonged, in short, to the third group, typified by our Common or Bread-wheat, and including the true Spelt or Dinkel. Pliny called it *tritici delicias*; Celsus recommended it; and Juvenal (i. 5. 70) reserved it for the master's table—'Sed tener et niveus mollique siligine factus Servetur domino.' Cato recommends it for the baking of cakes and the manufacture of starch (*amylum*); but Columella thought poorly

of it from the farmer's point of view, for the crop was light. *Σιτανίας* seems to have been the Greek equivalent, and Galen prescribed the one, as Celsus did the other; but *σιτανίας* was mainly spring-sown, while *σίλιγο* was a winter wheat. *Σίλιγνις* and *σιλιγνείτης ἄρτος* mean the fine white starchy flour and bread from *σιτανίας*-wheat, and *στλεγγὺς Ἀλεξάνδρειος* in Theophrastus is, conjecturally, *v.l.* or *f.l.* for *σίλιγνις*. It was a very different thing from *σεμίδαλις* and *σεμίδαλειτης*, a heavy, pasty, glutinous produce of a *durum*-wheat; but the latter is more wholesome and more nutritious,

and fetches a higher price in Italy to-day than the white flour of bread-wheat. *Robus* is a difficult word. Columella meant by it a hard, bright, red wheat, and praised it for its heavy yield. Jasny, against other opinions, thinks it was a poulard-wheat, or else a prolific variety of red *durum*, half-way to poulard.

I find little to dissent from in this interesting book, but once in a while Mr. Jasny nods, or even dreams: as when he derives Eng. *harvest* from Lat. *arista*.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

OEDIPODAE CONFUSA DOMUS

Marie DELCOURT: *Œdipe, ou la Légende du Conquérant*. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. CIV.) Pp. xxiii+257; 8 plates. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1944. Paper, 150 fr.

THIS is a singular book, vitiated in many of its conclusions by taking for its basis a sociology now obsolete, though it was popular forty years ago or less, and talking as if savage customs were things of yesterday in early classical Greece, instead of lying a millennium or more behind the earliest documents we have. Further, it pushes to conclusions logical but absurd a principle which the author herself (p. 223) admits not to be fully valid, that a myth is 'un rite en décadence'. Now it is quite true that many myths arise from attempts to explain customs no longer self-intelligible, whether religious or not, and many of these myths are Greek. No one, for instance, remembered any longer why a stick at Chaironeia and a stone at Delphi were held worthy of honour, nor why a young man at Amathus pretended to be a woman in labour. Consequently it was said that the stick was Agamemnon's sceptre, the stone the one which Kronos swallowed by mistake for the infant Zeus, and that Ariadne died in childbed on Cyprus and Theseus founded a cult of her there. But other stories, notably the Rape of Persephone, seem

coeval with the corresponding cults, while others again, and still more many sagas, seem to have no discoverable links with any ritual. Consequently it is not a thing to be merely assumed that Oidipus and his adventures spring from ancient custom, that 'il n'y a pas d'Œdipe primitif' (p. ix) and that 'ce qui est primitif, ce sont les thèmes qui, en s'articulant les uns aux autres, sont devenus d'abord les gestes d'Œdipe, puis sa vie et enfin son caractère' (ibid.). Nothing in this monograph seems to the reviewer to invalidate the alternative explanations often put forward, that either Oidipus is a real king of Thebes, much obscured by fabulous details, or the whole story is a complex *märchen*,¹ having but a secondary connexion with Theban or other usages.

But setting aside these general considerations, the explanations offered for the events in the traditional story are by no means all readily acceptable. Let us take them in order. Oidipus is exposed because exposure is a sort of ordeal; a child in any way abnormal ought to be exposed, and if he survives, it proves that the gods have judged in his favour and he is a being remarkable indeed but not evil. But it is one of the fixed points of the story that Oidipus was, at birth, in no way abnormal or portentous, the

¹ To the author, a *märchen* is something functional, not (as most students, including the reviewer, take it) a story told for its own sake.

only unusual thing about him being the injury to his feet, which is variously explained but never said to be congenital. His killing of Laïos is an example of 'l'ancien prince de la succession par meurtre' (p. 92); but he does not succeed to the throne because he kills Laïos, and in any case Frazerian kingship is a very long way from being proved for Greece. The Sphinx which he overcomes is a blend of two things, nightmare and an *âme en peine* (pp. 108 ff.). She is also amorous. That some more or less Sphinx-like figures do fall into one or more of these categories is a reasonable supposition, set forth by the author with interesting documentation, written and monumental; it remains to be proved for the Theban Phix. The riddle which he must solve is a piece of initiation-propaganda (p. 151). Are there no other reasons for testing a man's wits? He succeeds to the throne by marrying Iokaste; this is a piece of mother-right and also has to do with passing into a superior age-class in which one may and does marry (ch. v). As regards mother-right, I do

not wish to recapitulate the proofs I furnished long ago of its non-existence in Greece and Rome;¹ age-classes have left such faint traces in Greek civilization that it is a hazardous thing to invoke them, even for the earliest origins of a traditional tale. The princess he marries is his mother; this has much to do with a union with Mother Earth (ch. vi). The argument seems to me unconvincing.

There is no space either to list the extraordinary statements, some wild in the extreme, some based on misunderstandings of texts, which invalidate many details of the argument, or, which is to be regretted, to give specimens of the many acute observations, ingenious combinations of facts, and other spurs to thought which make the book, its faults notwithstanding, far from negligible if it be used with discriminating and critical caution.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

¹ See *Folk-Lore*, xxii (1911), pp. 277 ff., xxx (1920), pp. 93 ff., xxxvii (1926), pp. 213 ff.

PAIDEIA III

Werner JAEGER: *Paideia*. The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. III. Translated from the German manuscript by Gilbert Highet. Pp. viii+374. Oxford: Blackwell, 1945. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

THIS volume is a descriptive work, dealing by paraphrase and comment with a generous selection of materials from the Hippocratics, Isocrates, Xenophon, Plato (*Phaedrus*, *Laws*), and Demosthenes. Its most notable feature is the attempt to relate the documents to the historical circumstances in which they were written. Thus J. holds that Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* was written before, and his *Peace* after, the Social War, the change of date explaining why the latter speech reverses the attitude of the former towards Athenian imperialism. J. has an enviable familiarity with Greek literature and history, and these reconstructions are always either sound or plausible, though at times expressed

with an assurance scarcely justified by the available data. The book is dominated by its materials rather than by its nominal subject, to which much of the contents is only faintly relevant. It makes clear what one suspected from the earlier volumes—that 'paideia' is for J. an extremely vague concept, a kind of hold-all, with room for everything from rules for health to the platitudes of rhetoric. Hence there is no attempt to sum up the whole matter, and the book ends with a chapter in which the word 'paideia' does not occur. The fact that neither the work nor its subject forms an 'organic structure', as was previously claimed, must excuse the disjointedness of the remarks which follow.

In vol. i J. gave scandal by apparently suggesting that the hitherto much valued concept of a universe governed by law and order was merely a psychological aberration on the part of the

Ionian philosophers, who 'projected upon nature' the idea of justice which had grown up (somehow) with the city-state. It is worth recording that he has abandoned this view; according to iii, c. 1 the Ionian spirit was responsible for the growth of Hippocratic medical science, for which J. has nothing but praise as a rational scheme firmly based, not on wishful thinking, but on observation of what really exists. This chapter, however, exaggerates the debt of Plato to Hippocrates. J. holds that 'contemporary medicine' was the model for the method of division, and the source of Plato's 'three-dimensional' way of describing the ideas (21, 38, 61). This is to force the *Gorgias* passages on medicine as a science, and to misunderstand *Phaedr.* 270 c, d, where Hippocrates has the modest part of merely confirming what 'the true argument' declares. Moreover, for assessing Plato's attitude towards contemporary medicine, *Rep.* 405-6 deserves greater weight than it receives; the mention of Herodicus does not seem to me to be made 'jokingly' as it does to J. (34). Nor does the fact that Plato called disease, drought, and injustice by the same name (*πλεονεξία*) justify finding a 'spiritual' content in such treatises as Diocles' most un-Platonic prescription for a day in the life of a health-fiend.

J. is rather too sure that Isocrates' *Against the Sophists* is mostly an answer to Plato's 'prospectuses' (i.e. *Gorg.*, *Prot.*); that *Laws* 686-7 contains a 'cruel satire' on one of Isocrates' Panhellenic programmes, and provoked *Philip* 12 as a retort; and that Isocrates' 'personal rancour' against the Academy was due to Aristotle's starting to teach rhetoric there. The reader who is not familiar with the texts should be warned that the whole 'history' of this 'conflict' is very highly speculative. For example, in more than one passage (e.g. on p. 68), if Isocrates was referring to Plato, he gives a mistaken account of Platonic teaching; and J. should say so. Such allusions are by no means 'obvious' (91); e.g. *Ad Nic.* 5-6 does not necessarily imply that Isocrates had *Gorg.* 470 in mind. Some of J.'s paraphrases here

are very awkward; *Ad Nic.* 1 does not say (88) that those who 'care for nothing but right action' ought to be accused of greed for power; nor does *Ad Nic.* 9 really require the good ruler to make his state *larger* (93).

It is a more serious matter that J. has nothing but approval for his all too modern version of 'Isocrates' faith that the interests of Greece are the highest moral law' (136). Similarly he states quite uncritically that Isocrates introduced the knowledge of historical 'fact' into 'paideia'. The notoriously bad effects of Isocratean rhetoric on historical writing are passed over in silence. J. does indeed mention Isocrates' habit of 'altering history' to suit his thesis and further his 'educational programme' (103). It appears then that 'paideia' as a 'cultural ideal' is to include deliberate falsifications of history in addition to so much else! To quote Plato's faint praise of him, there was 'some degree of philosophy' in Isocrates; but it is hard to share J.'s admiration for him as a political thinker. J. himself suffers a violent reaction in a much later chapter, where Isocrates appears (282-3) as a 'blind' leader, at the mercy of 'the force of inertia', whose pro-Macedonian proposals were 'an unforgivable political blunder'. The truth surely lies somewhere between J.'s two estimates.

On Plato J. once more appears as an unsafe guide. His account of *Laws* i and ii is crystallized in the remark (340): 'Plato' explains how to educate young men to fear intemperate pleasures by artificially releasing their impulses when drunk.' This is a really extraordinary instance of reading into Plato what is simply not there. In fact, so far from proposing such a foolish procedure, Plato prohibits all drunkenness in his young men (under 30); see *Laws* 666 b: *μέθης δὲ καὶ πολυονίας τὸ παράπαν τὸν νέον ἀπέχσθαι*. Again, it is not true that the ideal State according to *Rep.* 425 was to dispense with legislation (216); rather the task is left to the future rulers; nor is it true that in the *Laws* written rules are contemplated for 'every detail of conduct' (226). It is regrettable that at 709 b 7 J. follows an

old an
out v
(240)
and (1
ing
must
For t
I men
pare
goras
power
rule?
the d
Plato
Th

M. L.
170
ver
In th
of th
Engl
ninet
place
more
earlie
his w
circle
dealin
Engli
Scotla
and a
comm
of the
consi
Porsc
of the
maril
devot
their
of the
not th
In sul
veys
Histo
chitec
est v
literat
influe
upon
is cor

old and perverse emendation (θεόν) without warning the unsuspecting reader (240); and that he insists on the fanciful and (as 690 a 3 shows) impossible rendering 'axioms' for ἀξιώματα (235). But I must not attempt to exhaust the list. For typical inconsistencies of exposition I merely recommend the curious to compare pp. 22 and 192 (Pericles and Anaxagoras), pp. 239 and 240 (when was naval power first thought the cause of mob-rule?), and pp. 214 and 337 (n. 12) (do the doctrines of the *Epinomis* belong to Plato or to Philip of Opus?).

The final chapter—on Demosthenes

—is given over to hero-worship; even Demosthenes' appeal to Persia is thought to need no comment or excuse. One's impression is that J. is apt to find a new idol with almost every new chapter, as here Isocrates is discarded now for Plato and now for Demosthenes. As for 'paideia' in general, it entails much more than J. supposes—and also much less, if one ought to resist the view that it includes everything that any Greek ever tried to tell any other Greek.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

GREEK STUDIES IN ENGLAND

M. L. CLARKE: *Greek Studies in England 1700-1830*. Pp. 255. Cambridge: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 18s. net.

IN this book Mr. Clarke gives an account of the progress of Greek studies in England in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and indicates their place in contemporary life. He is much more successful than he was in his earlier essay on Richard Porson, and his wider theme will interest a wider circle of readers. After three chapters dealing in general terms with Greek in English schools and universities and in Scotland he goes on to record the aims and achievements, and to make some comments on the lives and personalities, of the scholars of the period, who are considered in three groups, pre-Porson, Porson, and post-Porson. The interests of these scholars, as he says, were primarily linguistic, and in the main they devoted themselves to Attic Greek; but their contribution to the dissemination of the knowledge of things Greek was not the only contribution of the time. In subsequent chapters Mr. Clarke surveys the progress made in other fields, History, Philosophy, Archaeology, Architecture; he also illustrates the interest which was displayed in Greek literature as literature and estimates the influence of Greek literature and thought upon contemporary poetry. The volume is concluded by five appendixes, of

which the most useful are two alphabetical lists, one of the names of the Greek scholars who flourished between 1700 and 1830, with some brief biographical notes, the other of the names of the Greek authors of whose works translations were published during the same period.

Scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were not backward in talking and writing about themselves and about their friends and enemies, particularly the latter, and Mr. Clarke had a rich mine of miscellaneous information on which to draw. It may be questioned, however, whether he would not have been wise to have less recourse to quotation. The very frequent citations of phrases, sentences, and whole paragraphs give his book something of the appearance of an anthology, and although some of the quotations are interesting as throwing useful light on the characters or mental attitudes of their authors, the upshot of many could with equal effect and greater lucidity have been conveyed in other ways. Still, Mr. Clarke does succeed in presenting a tolerably coherent picture of the intellectual and social background of an interesting period and in placing the stimulus of Greek studies in its proper perspective. There were not many giants—there never are—but the desire to learn more about ancient Greece was wide-

spread. Many were content to admire, others sought to use in contemporary affairs the products of the Greek genius. Much of the work that was done was doubtless barren, and some led to undesirable and inappropriate imitation,

but on balance the revival of Greek studies was beneficial to the intellectual and artistic life of the community.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS

- (1) Caesar: *De Bello Gallico I*, 1-29, edited by John GALLAGHER. Pp. xlv + 197. (2) Caesar: *De Bello Gallico II*, edited by John GALLAGHER. Pp. xlv + 163. (3) Horace: *Odes II*, edited by John GALLAGHER. Pp. xxvii + 191. (4) Horace: *Odes III*, edited by John GALLAGHER. Pp. xxvi + 262. (5) Horace: *Epodes*, edited by James TIERNEY. Pp. xix + 137. (6) Livy: *Book XXVI*, edited by James TIERNEY. Pp. xlviii + 246. (7) Cicero: *De Senectute*, edited by Richard FOLEY. Pp. xix + 208. (8) Virgil: *Aeneid III*, edited by Richard FOLEY. Pp. xxiv + 162. (9) Virgil: *Aeneid V*, edited by Richard FOLEY. Pp. xxiii + 144. (10) Virgil: *Aeneid II*, edited by Maurice DUGGAN. Pp. xxvii + 129. (11) Virgil: *Aeneid VI*, edited by Maurice DUGGAN. Pp. xxvii + 172. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1944-5. Boards, 2s. 3d. each. (12) Euripides: *Hecuba*, edited by Michael TIERNEY. Pp. xxvii + 170. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1946. Boards, 3s. 6d.

THE volumes in Messrs. Browne and Nolan's series of Latin Classics are compiled upon the traditional plan: each has an introduction, notes apart from the text, and a vocabulary. They are clearly printed on paper of good quality and they are fairly stoutly bound. If the absence of illustrations gives them a faintly old-fashioned appearance, the very reasonable price should recommend them for school use; it may be hoped that the publishers may consider adding to the series some works which are less easily accessible in school editions than most of those here under review. The notes assume a groundwork of knowledge of the language, but usually give really helpful explanations of syntactical difficulties. Greek is quoted sparingly, but it is encouraging to see

that it is considered worth while to quote it at all. There are occasional references to Irish language, lore, and history which give an interesting point to the commentary on certain passages. Mr. Gallagher's two volumes of Caesar have some barely adequate maps, and his introduction to the *Odes* of Horace incorporates an excursus on the metres by Professor M. Tierney. He is a careful and competent guide and strikes the reader as being engaged upon works for which he has a real admiration. Mr. James Tierney, on the other hand, cannot have been happy about editing the *Epodes*. He denounces 'a persistent, pretentious unreality, practical absence of any true and sincere feeling (unless *Epodes* 1 and 2 are slight exceptions), lack of dramatic sense (*Epodes* 5, 17, etc.), long-winded and inapposite use of an unreal mythology, second-rate and nearly always borrowed thoughts inadequately expressed'. But he is more at home with Livy, and he has some excellent things to say about his work in the introduction to *Book XXVI*. The four volumes on the *Aeneid* call for little remark, but Mr. Duggan deserves warm praise for his careful explanation of the assault on Priam's palace, which he illustrates by an intelligible diagram. Mr. Foley's commentary on the *De Senectute* is kept very brief, but he adds an admirable biographical index. Teachers will inevitably disagree about the merits of vocabularies. Their presence doubtless encourages the notion that each Latin word has a readily assignable English equivalent, and even where, as in these volumes, an effort is made to give a wider picture of the history of a word and its uses, the less industrious pupil will always use them unintelligently. ('Oh, sir, but it says in the

voca
stud
time
are p
vide
pile
valu
It
Tirr
1938
Serie
text,
more
bold
direc
of a
place

Joseph
(Un
cal
Berl
Cal
THIS b
rose's
ramifi
not vo
questi
blanc
ing the
out by
but wa
most s
the La
natura
test th
Lykaon
in that
rather
man's
narrati
Aioro,
Motif-
relevan
omits
resemb
indicat
forms
highly
ward s
as into
Napish
of these
most cl
meval
Profess
suasive
The
study s

vocabulary . . .') But when classical studies have to compete jealously for time against many rivals, vocabularies are probably necessary, and those provided in this series are carefully compiled and in some cases constitute a valuable reinforcement of the notes.

It is interesting to compare Professor Tierney's *Hecuba* with that produced in 1938 by Mr. King in the Alpha Classics Series. Both are based on the Oxford text, but K. makes the drama much more readily intelligible to beginners by boldly printing a very full set of stage directions in English after the manner of a modern play. T. more cautiously places his analysis of each scene among

the notes, where it is in danger of being forgotten by the 'junior students' for whom it is primarily intended. He gives much fuller attention to metre than K. and deals more adequately with difficulties such as οἶσθ' οὖν ὁ δράσων. An amusing contrast occurs at v. 626, φροντῖδων βουλευματα, on which K.'s note reads 'devisings of trouble' and T.'s 'almost literally "wishful thinking"'. It may be hoped that this volume will have successors, for the supply of suitable Greek authors for use with junior pupils is at present a difficult matter.

D. S. COLMAN.

The Schools, Shrewsbury.

SHORT REVIEWS

Joseph FONTENROSE: *Philemon, Lot, and Lycaon*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 13, No. 4.) Pp. 93-120. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, 25 c.

THIS brief study, written with Professor Fontenrose's usual thoroughness and sobriety, traces the ramifications of the Babylonian flood-myth in some not very obvious directions. The Philemon in question is the husband of Baucis. The resemblance between his story and that of Lot entertaining the 'angels' in Sodom had already been pointed out by T. K. Cheyne and is indeed fairly obvious, but wanted detailed analysis. Furthermore, the most striking common feature of the Hebrew and the Latin-Phrygian tales, the presence of a supernatural being or beings in human form, come to test the piety of men, recurs in the legend of Lycaon and his reception of Zeus—most strikingly in that form of it which represents not Lycaon but rather his sons as guilty of impiously serving up man's flesh to the god. Not only do all three narratives combine more or less clearly Nos. A1010, A1018, K1811, and Q1.1 of Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (one of the very few relevant pieces of literature which the author omits to mention), but they all contain further resemblances, such as the founding of cults, or indications that cults were founded in the original forms of the tales. Hence a common origin is highly plausible, and one is to be found in a westward spreading into Phrygia and Greece as well as into Palestine of the Babylonian tale of Ut-Napishtim and the deluge. Finally, some at least of these stories have in common a detail preserved most clearly in Norse tradition, that of the primeval trees which became human beings, or so Professor Fontenrose argues, perhaps less persuasively than in the rest of his monograph.

The main contentions of this very meritorious study seem to the reviewer to have been made out;

hypothetical details, as usual in such a case, are here and there disputable, but considerable space would be needed to go into them and the rejection of them all would still leave standing the essential part of the author's thesis.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Willem VAN DER WIELEN: *De Ideegetallen van Plato*. Pp. xii+270. Amsterdam: D. B. Centen, 1941. Paper.

THIS doctoral dissertation sets out clearly and conveniently the materials for reconstructing Plato's doctrine of numbers, quoting (with parallel translation) or paraphrasing, and discussing, the relevant passages from Aristotle and from the Platonic dialogues. Three kinds of numbers are to be distinguished according to Plato: (1) ordinary numbers, consisting of unequal units (like two cows or two armies—*Phileb.* 56 d, e); (2) mathematical numbers, consisting of units exactly equal to one another—these are the numbers recognized by the philosopher (*ibid.*); (3) ideal numbers or ideas of numbers (*Phaedo* 101 b, c), which do not consist of units, and are therefore 'inadmissible' and neither greater nor less than, nor equal to, one another. These ideal numbers are eternal and therefore not generated; but van der Wielen is satisfied by the rather tenuous evidence of Aristotle and Simplicius that Plato gave a picture, διδασκαλίας χάριν, of their generation from two principles, the one and the great-and-small, which he identifies with the 'limit' and 'unlimited' of *Phileb.* 23 c ff. In this picture the generation of ideal numbers was illustrated by the sequence of ratios 'generated' by the movement of a point along a finite straight line.

But is the further statement true that Plato identified the ideas with these ideal numbers? Van der W. thinks so. But he appreciates, and brings out clearly, the great gap in the theory at

this point: Plato 'never fully worked out' the doctrine that the ideal numbers are the explanation, the constitutive principles, of all things. This work is earlier than Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Academy*, and its value appears to me to lie in the unconscious testimony which it bears to the truth of Cherniss's solution—that the doctrine of the identification of the ideas with the ideal numbers was never adopted by Plato and is really one of the 'interpretations' or deductions by which Aristotle sought to refute the Platonic theory of ideas by reducing it—as this identification effectively does—to absurdity.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

G. L. MUSKENS: *De vocis ἀναλογίας significatione ac usu apud Aristotelem*. Pp. 99. Groningen: Wolters, 1943. Paper.

HERE we have another happy example of the way in which continental scholarship continued to flourish during the war—a doctoral dissertation presented in 1943 at Nijmegen, which was to be severely damaged the next year. There has of late been a vigorous school of Aristotelian studies in the Netherlands, and we are encouraged to hope for more.

Dr. Muskens, who writes in serviceable, though scarcely elegant, scholastic Latin, goes carefully through the passages where Aristotle uses the words ἀναλογία and ἀνάλογον, and the conclusion he reaches is (p. 91) 'Analogiam, si nihil additur, proportionalitatem geometricam significare saepius apparet, arithmetica proportionalitas semper adiecto vocabulo indicatur. Originis illius (mathematica ab arte dico) vestigia ἀναλογία ac ἀνάλογον apud Aristotelem semper servavit. . . . Igitur vox ἀναλογία ferme ubique vocabulo proportionalitatis (evenredigheid) interpretanda est. Quod per media aeva nostroque tempore "analogia" largiore usurpatur sensu, Aristoteli id non est imputandum, quippe qui id quod nos vocabulis "analogia attributionis" significamus, nunquam cum analogia coniungat, sed elocutione "πρός τι", "πρός ἑν", "ἀφ' ἑνός" vel eiusmodi indicet.' He emphasizes (p. 90) that in, e.g., *Met.* Γ₂, Δ₇, Ε₂, Ζ₁, Κ₃, 8, which foreshadow the scholastic doctrine of analogy, ἀναλογία is never used, while (p. 68) in *E.N.* 1096^b28 it is distinguished from πρὸς ἑν and ἀφ' ἑνός (cf. *Simp. Ph.* 1096^b29, quoted on p. 18, and by Sir W. D. Ross in his note on *Ph.* 249^a23-5). His case seems admirably made out.

Analogies between genera and species are naturally the basis of Aristotle's comparative anatomy, and the proportion of quotations from the biological works is instructive. In discussing *E.N.* 1096^b28 Dr. Muskens aptly points out its advance on *E.E.* 1217^b33-35, and his treatment of the *Magna Moralia* is likewise admirable, giving additional grounds for regarding it, with Jaeger and Walzer, as a product of post-Aristotelian Peripateticism, as against von Arnim. There are conjectural emendations, some attractive, of *Pr.* 918^b34 (ἐν τοῖς ὀρέσιν <καὶ τοῖς βασινοῦ>), *Mem.* 452^b21 (ποῆσαι for νοῆσαι), *Met.* 1016^b11 (ἐς, ἐπεὶ), 1048^a35 (θεωρεῖται τοῦτε <τὸ α> ἐνεργεία), 1093^b17 (ἀλλ' ἀλλοις for ἀλλήλοισι), and *Rh.* 1412^b34 (ἢ

or αὐ μὲν for ἀεὶ), while *P.A.* 645^b22 is aptly brought to bear on the interpretation of *Met.* 1016^b31 ff.

The diagram illustrating *Met.* 376^a differs from that of Ideler and Webster; neither is completely satisfactory, but it is probably too much to hope for one that is; on *Cael.* 309^a14-15 see now Guthrie's note, and on σύμφυτον πνεῦμα (p. 46) Peck in his edition of *G.A.*; at *G.A.* 761^a27 read διέστηκεν, δοῦν ζωτικώτερον with Peck, and at *Pol.* 1301^b27 οὐ μὴ (probably) with Schneider and Immisch. On p. 14 a clause has dropped out of the quotation from *Top.* 138^b1-5, and on p. 21, l. 13 omit 'non' before 'generatum' ('Timaeum et alios' is odd in l. 12); but misprints are rarely troublesome, though γεωμετρικός occurs two or three times.

The order of treatment is, with modifications, historical, but the chronology adopted is occasionally highly dubious: the *Poetics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* must surely be put after the foundation of the Lyceum. The bibliography is frequently archaic: Archer-Hind's is regarded as the standard work on the *Timaeus*, and Prantl's on the *De Caelo* and *De Gen. et Corr.*

Dr. Muskens's is an intricate piece of work that was certainly worth doing, and he has done it carefully and well.

D. A. REES.

Merton College, Oxford.

Lettres d'Humanité, Tome IV. Pp. 234. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper.

THE Association Guillaume Budé is to be congratulated on producing the fourth volume of *Lettres d'Humanité* so soon after the war and on having secured a wide variety of contributions. There are two articles of special interest to classical readers. *Lucretius et le Monde* by Pierre Boyancé is an attractive lecture, which, without making much fresh contribution to the understanding of Lucretius, draws attention to some of the paradoxes of the *De Rerum Natura*. In order to exhibit the 'arrière-plan' of atoms and the void which lies behind the sensible world, Lucretius has to use the analogy of the sensible; in order to persuade men of the rationality of the Epicurean system he has to arouse their emotions by poetry. Again, the world is mortal and it is very imperfect—*tanta stat praedita culpa*—yet it is to be the scene of perfect Epicurean happiness. The author believes that there are indications in the poem that Lucretius himself felt the burden of this last paradox and that it may be that in despair of a solution he committed suicide. *Le Dieu Janus et les Origines de Rome* by Pierre Grimal is a substantial essay of over 100 pages (written at Caen in 1944) which is an important attempt to unravel the 'enigma of Janus'. The author holds that previous investigators have made the mistake of trying to find one 'principle' to explain all the phenomena instead of considering separately the evidence of theology, mythology, ritual, archaeology, etc. He concludes himself that the Janus of classical times was a conflation of two elements, one a *numen* of 'passage' (*Eanus), whose presence was felt at gates and thoroughfares, and especially as *Ianus Geminus* at the gate of the 'Forum-city' and on the 'bastion'

of the
Capito
ing its
abstra
dence
Arx as
author
to prov
a 'pas
(bifron
Minor
Rome.
the b
Cicero
cosmos
links i
binds
hint o
Etruria
with t
essay i
the rig
to hav

Henry
raire
Les
THE fir
a lexic
cism, a
always
few: su
is not;
'pointe
(2. 6. 8)
the oth
are not
iurare,
business
usage o
each wo
are prop
whole b
guage a
norm. '—first
Quintili
meaning
Lucilius
not in C
In th
his 'con
Most of
Cicero v
account
Seneca
Cicero,
In proof
lists of
is the p
hians w
or of cor
the Cice
In view
surprisin
due allo

of the city against its enemies—the Arx of the Capitol, which was the original 'Ianiculum', deriving its name not from the god Janus but from an abstract substantive **ianus*, -us 'going'. The evidence for the Forum-city is slight, as also for the Arx as 'Ianiculum' (Virg. *Aen.* viii. 357-8), and the author is hard put to it in regard to both 'Ianicula' to prove that a 'bastion' would naturally be called a 'passage'. The other element is a two-faced (*bifrons*) deity who came originally from Asia Minor and Syria by way of Sicily and Etruria to Rome. He was connected with the sky and was the basis of the familiar identifications from Cicero's time onwards of Janus as the heaven, the cosmos, time, etc. Here again there are slender links in the chain, and Grimal never satisfactorily binds the two elements together, except in the hint once given that the god came to Rome from Etruria with the name of Ani, which was identified with that of the 'passage-numen' Ianus. The essay is ingenious and suggestive, especially as to the right method of inquiry, but it cannot be said to have solved this age-long 'enigma'.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Henry BARDON: *Le Vocabulaire de la Critique littéraire chez Sénèque le Rhéteur*. Pp. 114. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940. Paper, 35 fr.

THE first fifty pages of M. Bardon's book consist of a lexicon of Seneca's vocabulary of literary criticism, a useful piece of work, carefully (though not always very critically) done. Omissions are very few: *suspiciosus* is here, but *insidiosus* (C. 10 pr. 15) is not; *longe petitit* appears, but not *aliquid petentes*, 'pointed' (3 pr. 2, 10 pr. 15); one example of *dulcis* (2. 6. 8) and one of *historiae* (1 pr. 18) are lacking. On the other hand, several words are included which are not terms of literary criticism at all; *calumniam iurare*, for example, a technical term of law, has no business to be here. And the references to the usage of Cicero and Quintilian which are given for each word, though often interesting in themselves, are prognostic of a fallacy which runs through the whole book—the tendency to treat Seneca's language as a series of deviations from a Ciceronian norm. '*abstinere manus*', "ne pas faire un emprunt"—first example of the usage—very rare—not in Quintilian. But there is nothing rare about it: meaning 'keep one's hands off', it is in Plautus, Lucilius, Cicero himself. '*corripere*', "malmener", not in Cicero; true, but it is in Caesar.

In the second part, in which M. Bardon sets out his 'conclusions', the fallacy is developed at length. Most of them are based on a comparison with Cicero which leaves all sorts of differences out of account, and his way of putting them is revealing: Seneca 'has not remembered' this or that in Cicero, or even 'a eu tort de ne pas se souvenir'. In proof of the poverty of S.'s vocabulary he gives lists of words used by C. and not by S. But what is the point of noting that S. does not use *hiare* or *hians* when S. has no occasion to mention hiatus? or of complaining that S. does not use *sententia* in the Ciceronian meanings of 'sense' and 'phrase'? In view of the title of his work it would be more surprising if he did. M. Bardon has not even made due allowance for the comparative bulk of Seneca's

prefaces and incidental comments on the one hand and Cicero's rhetorical corpus on the other. What is worse, he fails to appreciate the distinctive character of Seneca's work. Seneca is not writing a formal treatise on rhetorical technique: he is writing (or professing to write) informal reminiscences. Hence the semi-conversational idiom in which much of his charm consists; naturally, it is an idiom of his day, not of Cicero's. One cannot help wondering why M. Bardon should have taken up the study of a writer with whom he shows so little sympathy. His assertion that, next to Cicero, Seneca's 'essential source' was Varro—based on little more than the fact that both have *inaequaliter* and share not very remarkable uses of *sequi* and *transferre*—might be thought the height of *naïveté* if it were not matched by the assertion that *parilem* 'serait un terme poétique emprunté par Sénèque à Lucrèce (1, 1067) ou à Ovide (*Met.* 8, 631)'.

There are strange gaps in the bibliography. For Seneca's usage it has Altheim's work of 1886 but not Cerrati's useful, though not always accurate, *Grammatica di S. il R.* of 1908; for Cicero's, it has not Fuchs's index to the *De Inventione*. And by ascribing Kiessling's 1872 Teubner text to 1935, which is the date of a reprint made over forty years after Kiessling's death, M. Bardon seems to have misled himself into taking it for a modern edition: it is almost incredible that a student of Seneca should not know H. J. Müller's edition of 1886, but he never refers to it.

'Un esprit qui n'est pas critique que par à-coups.' So says M. Bardon, judicially, of poor Seneca; the words would apply very well to himself.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Günther ZUNTZ: *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*. (British Academy Supplemental Papers, No. VII.) Pp. 127. London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Paper, 12s. 6d. net.

DR. ZUNTZ's monograph carries a stage further the discussion begun by Mrs. New (*Harvard Theol. Rev.* xxi. 376-95) and A. C. Clark (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 305-29; cf. *J.T.S.* xxix. 19). These scholars independently conceived and maintained the view that the Philoxenian Syriac version of the N.T. (A.D. 508), which, since Gwynn's discussion of the problem, had been thought to have perished (save for the 'Pococke Epistles' and the 'Crawford Apocalypse'), was in fact preserved as the text of the Harklean version (A.D. 616), while the real contribution of Thomas of Harkel was the select apparatus of important variant readings generally known as the 'Harklean margin'. This view gained the adhesion of Père Lagrange but not of Sir Frederic Kenyon. It is now challenged by Dr. Zuntz. Like his predecessors he appeals to the Harklean colophons, which he sets out with commentary and constructive interpretation (pp. 13-33). Next he argues that if the Harklean text is in fact the same as the Philoxenian, we should expect to find traces of it in the N.T. quotations of Syriac Fathers who wrote between 508 and 616. But the conclusion of an investigation of sixth-century quotations, including those in the later writings

of Philoxenus himself, is that they show a text intermediate in character between the fifth-century Peshitta and the seventh-century Harklean (pp. 34-76). The third part of the work (pp. 77-121) deals with the ancestry of the Philoxenian text and its relation to the labours of 'Euthalius' and Pamphilus. The conclusion of the whole matter is that 'Thomas of Harkel revised the Philoxeniana. The Philoxeniana was a revision of the Peshitta on the basis of a "Euthalian" *ἔκδοσις*. The work of "Euthalius" finally was based on Pamphilus' (p. 113); and that 'the basis of the Philoxenian version was a Caesarean text of particular purity' (p. 77).

Besides this main argument there are several subsidiary discussions of matters of more general interest to classical scholars, notably on systems of capitulation (pp. 80 ff.), reading *κατὰ προσηγορίαν* and *κατὰ διαστολήν* (89 ff.), and writing *per cola et commata* (94 ff.).

Dr. Zuntz's work is a most valuable contribution to the study of a very obscure and difficult part of N.T. textual history. It reopens a question that was widely thought to be closed; and it points the way to further investigations which would certainly be highly interesting and might well be very fruitful.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

GILLES QUISPÉL: *De Bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*. Pp. viii+148. Leiden: Burgersdijk & Niermans, 1943. Paper.

THIS doctoral thesis is scholarly work, particularly stimulating where it disagrees with Harnack. Though we know that Tertullian drew frequently upon Irenaeus and the Apologists, the sources of his attack upon Marcion are not easily determined, since much anti-Marcionite literature has perished, including works by Justin and Theophilus of Antioch which he and Irenaeus may have used.

After examining the history of its three successive editions, Quispel argues that each book of *Adversus Marcionem* has not only a particular theme but also a particular source. Book I depends directly upon Irenaeus, not, as Harnack claimed, on Justin's anti-Marcion. The chief source of Book II is the lost *Adversus Marcionem* of Theophilus, to which Loofs attributed so much of Irenaeus' material. Book III uses Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. IV and V examine Marcion's *Antitheses* and New Testament.

It would be unwise to accept all Quispel's conclusions before they have been well tested by workers in this field. Many parallels could be explained without supposing literary dependence. Knowledge of Irenaeus need not be questioned, and use of Justin's *Dialogue* is highly probable (note their common text of Daniel vii. 13 against LXX and Theodotion). But while Tertullian may well have read Theophilus' *Adversus Marcionem*, any

argument for verbal dependence upon a lost work must be precarious. As to Books IV and V, the chief interest lies in the author's challenge to Harnack. He questions his reconstruction of the *Antitheses*; more important, he rejects the prevailing opinion (Harnack, Von Soden) that Tertullian had before him a Latin text of Marcion's canon. Admitting that Tertullian possessed a Latin version of the New Testament, Quispel believes that in this instance he was translating from a Greek text of the Marcionite scriptures. And certainly he produces points which are better explained on this hypothesis; at the least he convicts Harnack of hasty conclusions and demonstrates the weakness of some of his arguments from style.

S. L. GREENSLADE

University of Durham.

ELISE VAN HALL: *Over den Oorsprong van de Grieksche Grafstele*. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, IX). Pp. xii+222; 26 figs. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1942. Paper, 10s. net.

THIS is a doctorate dissertation, written in Dutch but with a résumé some twenty pages long in French, which is very conveniently supplied with references to the corresponding pages in the text and to some of the notes. The conclusion reached is that the sepulchral stela, and the herm too, originated primarily as a substitute body in which the soul of the dead could reside, *faute de mieux*. Not all the evidence fits conveniently with this explanation, and the very principle of such speculation is open to question. One objection that will immediately occur is that two such different types of monument are not likely to have been inspired to any great extent by one and the same idea; the arguments brought forward are not convincing enough to outweigh this inherent weakness. The inconsistency of Greek beliefs on conditions after death also gives reason to doubt whether a logical explanation can apply to either practice. Both sentiment and superstition with regard to dead relatives pressed harder on the ancient Greeks than on us, yet on this topic the most rational of us is subject to thinking along irreconcilably diverse lines almost simultaneously; we know from Greek literature and vases that their thoughts were worse muddled. So, as often happens in books on ancient religion, the collection of material in the notes is more worth reading than the exegesis. In particular, attention should be called to a brief but apparently well-documented summary of the types of sepulchral monuments now in use in Indonesia that are comparable to the Greek stela and herm; since the literature upon them is practically all in Dutch and very scattered, this section (pp. 109-23) would be invaluable for comparative studies with a wider scope.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Bayet (J.)** Tite-Live: Histoire Romaine. Tome IV (Livre IV). (Collection Budé.) Pp. viii+158. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946. Paper, 125 fr.
- Baynes (N. H.)** The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome. (James Bryce Memorial Lecture, 1945.) Pp. 48. London: Oxford University Press, 1946. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Bloesch (H.)** Antike Kunst in der Schweiz. Fünfzig Meisterwerke aus dem klassischen Altertum in öffentlichem und privatem Besitz. Pp. 228; 17 figs., 79 plates. Erlench, Zürich: Rentsch, 1946. Cloth, 28 Sw. fr.
- Broch (H.)** The Death of Virgil. Translated by J. S. Untermeyer. Pp. 494. London: Routledge, 1946. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Colin (G.)** Hypéride: Discours. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 321. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1946. Paper, 300 fr.
- De Lepper (J. L. M.)** De rebus gestis Bonifatii comitis Africae et magistri militum. Pp. xi+121. Breda: Bergmans, 1941. Paper.
- Frisch (H.)** Cicero's Fight for the Republic. The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics. (Humanitas, I.) Pp. 311; 9 plates. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1946. Paper, kr. 25.
- Godel (R.)** Cité et Univers de Platon. Dialogues et images cinématographiques. Pp. 158; ill. Beyrouth: Les Lettres Françaises, 1944. Paper, 100 fr.
- Grant (M.)** From Imperium to Auctoritas. A Historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 B.C.-A.D. 14. Pp. xvii+510; 12 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1946. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Harding (D. P.)** Milton and the Renaissance Ovid. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. XXX, No. 4.) Pp. 105. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Paper, \$1.50.
- Kramer (J. M.)** De Ilias als Vredesgedicht. Pp. 164. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1946. Paper.
- Lord (L. E.)** Thucydides and the World War. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. XII.) Pp. xiii+300. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Meurig-Davies (E. L. B.)** (1) Emendations of Lucretius. Pp. 3. (2) Emendations of Ammianus Marcellinus. Pp. 3. (3) Emendations of Ammianus Marcellinus (II). Pp. 9. (4) Emendations of S.H.A. Pp. 7. (5) Notes on the Philostrati and Callistratus. Pp. 16. Published by the author, 1946, and obtainable from him at 10 Brookside, Headington, Oxford. Paper, 1s. net each.
- Most (W. G.)** The Syntax of the Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae. (Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XX.) Pp. xxi+356. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946. Paper.
- Muller (H.)** Christians and Pagans from Constantine to Augustine. Part I. The Religious Policies of the Roman Emperors. Pp. iii+155. Pretoria: Union Booksellers, 1946. Paper, 14s.
- Postma (E. B. J.)** Augustinus de Beata Vita ingeleid en toegelicht. Pp. iv+274. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1946. Paper, fl. 6.50.
- Schulz (F.)** History of Roman Legal Science. Pp. xvi+358. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Sluiter (T. H.)** L. Annaei Senecae Oedipus. Specimen editionis criticae. Pp. 126. Groningen: de Waal, 1941. Paper, \$1.50. (To be obtained from the author at 47 Frans Halsstraat, Utrecht.)
- Thiel (J. H.)** Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times. Pp. 456. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1946. Cloth, 25s. net.
- von der Mühl (P.)** Homeri Odyssea. (Editiones Helveticae, Series Graeca 4.) Pp. x+468. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1946. Boards.
- Wood (E. J.)** Virgil and Today. (Presidential Lecture to the Leeds Branch of the Classical Association, 1945.) Pp. 28. Paper, 1s. 6d. (Obtainable from the Secretary of the Branch, Department of Greek, The University, Leeds 2.)

ador, *ador*

Alexander

alica, 121

Allard Pie

119

American

summar

amylium, 1

Atwood a

aurae, 104

Austin (R

Bailey (C.

Barber (E

(I), 26

Bardon's

Sénèque

Baynes (N

Beazley (

Art, 47

Bell (H. I.

83; on

and By

Bibliothec

Blakeney'

Bluck (R.

BOOKS E

Boswinkel

Bowra's S

Milton,

Broadhead

Brogan (C

85

Brown's S

Buchthal

Paganis

Budé text

113; Fro

109; Iso

116

Cahn's D

Campbell

of Sale,

Campbell

103 ff.

Campbell'

cum Ep

Cary (M.)

Thucyd

Catin's E

Cherniss's

Aristotle

Circius, 10

Clarke's G

Classical

Classical

1, 2), 98

colligere g

Colman (I

Coxon (A.

Craig (J.

Verse, 1

David, va

Papyri,

Davis (G.

de aqua

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- ador, *adoreum*, 121
 Alexander's *Seneca's Dialogues*, 38
 alica, 121
 Allard Pierson Museum, catalogues of (VII i, XI), 119
 American Philological Association, *Transactions* of, summarized (LXXV), 99
 amyllum, 121
 Atwood and Whittaker's *Excidium Troiae*, 98
 aurae, 104
 Austin (R. G.) Quintilian XII to 27-8: 20

 Bailey (C.) on *Lettres d'Humanité* (IV), 128
 Barber (E. A.) on Trypanis's 'H' *Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Πολιτεία* (I), 26
 Bardon's *Le Vocabulaire de la Critique littéraire chez Sénèque le Rhéteur*, 129
 Baynes (N. H.) on Werner's *Der Untergang Roms*, 84
 Beazley (J. D.) on Markman's *The Horse in Greek Art*, 47; on Richter's *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, 49
 Bell (H. I.) on *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* (I-IIIa), 83; on West and Johnson's *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, 89
 Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina, 57
 Blakeney's *Between Times*, 52
 Bluck (R. S.) Notes on Plato's *Seventh Letter*, 7
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 54, 99, 131
 Boswinkel's *Einige Wiener Papyri*, 83
 Bowra's *Sophoclean Tragedy*, 20; his *From Virgil to Milton*, 73
 Broadhead (H. D.) *Aeschylus Persae* 320-2: 4
 Brogan (O.) on Gren's *Kleinasien und der Ostbalkan*, 85
 Brown's *S. Aureli Augustini de Beata Vita*, 97
 Buchthal (H.) on Friedländer's *Documents of Dying Paganism*, 46
 Budé texts: *Anthologia Palatina* (V-VI), 67; *Apuleius*, 113; *Frontinus de aquae ductu*, 80; *Heliodorus* (III), 109; *Isocrates* (III), 107; *Prudentius* (I), 78, (II), 116
 Cahn's *Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos*, 117
 Campbell (A. H.) on de Zulueta's *The Roman Law of Sale*, 45
 Campbell (A. Y.) *Horace's Odes* I xxviii 7-15, 24: 103 ff.
 Campbell's (A. Y.) *Quinti Horati Flacci Carminum Epodis*, 112
 Cary (M.) on Gomme's *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (I), 27
 Catin's *En lisant Tite-Live*, 79
 Cherniss's *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, 31; his *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy* (I), 32
 Cicircus, 107
 Clarke's *Greek Studies in England*, 125
 Classical Association, meeting of, 57
 Classical Philology summarized (XL 3. 4), 53, (XLI 1, 2), 98
 colligere gradum, unguis, 62
 Colman (D. S.) on some school books, 126
 Coxon (A. H.) on Verdenius's *Parmenides*, 68
 Craig (J. D.) 'Counterpoint' in English and Latin Verse, 14
 David, van Groningen, and van Oven's *The Warren Papyri*, 83
 Davis (G. R. C.) on Grimal's Budé text of *Frontinus de aquae ductu*, 80
 Dawson's *Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape Painting*, 90
 Deceleian war, 13
 de Jonge's *Ad Apulei Madaurensis Metamorphoseon librum secundum commentarius*, 82
 Delcourt's *Oedipe*, 122
 Deman's *Le Témoignage d'Aristote sur Socrate*, 69
 de Zulueta's *The Roman Law of Sale*, 45
 D'Hérouville's *L'Astronomie de Virgile and Géographiques I-II*, 37
 Dodds's *Euripides, Bacchae*, 64
 Duggan's *Virgil, Aeneid II, VI*, 126
 Dunbabin (R. L.) Notes on the new Liddell and Scott, 8
 Dura-Europos, 50, 88
 durum wheat, 121

 epitaphs, 38
 Eranos, 1
 Euripides, concordance to, 58; projected edition of fragments of, 58

 far, 121
 Festugière's *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (I), 91
 Feyel's *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie*, 41; his *Contributions à l'épigraphie béotienne*, 87
 Flacelière's *Plutarque sur l'E de Delphes*, 108
 Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Alexander's *Seneca's Dialogues*, 38
 Foley's *Cicero, de senectute*, and *Virgil, Aeneid III, V*, 126
 Fontenrose's *Philemon, Lot, and Lycan*, 127
 Forbes (P. B. R.) on Maat's *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio*, 52
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Richardson's *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*, 34; on Bardon's *Le Vocabulaire de la Critique littéraire chez Sénèque le Rhéteur*, 129
 Forster (E. S.) on Godel's *Recherche d'une Foi*, 51; on Blakeney's *Between Times*, 52; on Glover's *Springs of Hellas*, 95
 Fränkel's *Ovid*, 76
 Friedländer's *Documents of Dying Paganism*, 46

 Gallagher's *Caesar, De Bello Gallico* I 1-29, II; *Horace, Odes II, III*, 126
 Giles (A. F.) on Marsh's *Modern Problems in the Ancient World*, 40; on Salmon's *History of the Roman World 30 B.C.-A.D. 138*, 43
 glomerare, glomus, 61
 Glover's *Springs of Hellas*, 95
 Godel's *Recherche d'une Foi*, 51
 Goldschmidt's *Paulinus' Churches at Nola*, 97
 Gomme (A. W.) on Murray's *The Arbitration*, 25
 Gomme's *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (I), 27
 Greenslade (S. L.) on Kelly's *Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome*, 52; on Quispel's *De Bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, 130
 Gren's *Kleinasien und der Ostbalkan*, 85
 Grimal's Budé text of *Frontinus de aquae ductu*, 80

 Hackforth (R.) on Deman's *Le Témoignage d'Aristote sur Socrate*, 69
 Hackforth's *Plato's Examination of Pleasure*, 29
 Haight's *More Essays on Greek Romances*, 33

- Halliday (W. R.) on Soury's *La Démonologie de Phalarque*, 70
 Henry (R. M.) on Wilkinson's *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*, 74; on Brown's *S. Aureli Augustini de Beata Vita*, 97
 Hill (H.) *Livy IX* 11 10: 63
 Hoeft Prize (1947), 58
 horses in Greek art, 47
- Ianus, 128
 Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, 1
 Io, wanderings of, 2
- Jacoby (F.) *Pausanias VIII* 45 1: 19
 Jaeger (W.) *Archilochus fr.* 67: 103
 Jaeger's *Paideia* (III), 123
 Jasny's *The Wheat of Classical Antiquity*, 120
 Jenkins (C.) on Goldschmidt's *Paulinus' Churches at Nola*, 97
 Juvenal, new tenth-century MS. of, 1
- Kelly's *Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome*, 52
 Kerényi and Mann's *Romandichtung und Mythologie*, 93
 Kerényi's *Hermes der Seelenführer*, 93
 Kitto (H. D. F.) on Bowra's *Sophoclean Tragedy*, 20; on Dodds's *Euripides, Bacchae*, 64
- L'Antiquité Classique*, 1; summarized (IX–XII), 53, (XIII), 98
Latomus, 1
 Lattimore's *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, 38
 Lavarenne's Budé text of *Prudentius* (I), 78, (II), 116
 Lawrence (A. W.) on *Excavations at Dura-Europos* (ninth season, part i), 88; on Dawson's *Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape Painting*, 90; on Allard Pierson Museum Catalogues (VII i, XI), 119; on van Hall's *Over den Oorsprong van de Grieksche Grafstele*, 130
 Leonard and Smith's *Lucretius*, 71
Lettres d'Humanité (IV), 128
 Loeb Classical Library: *Isocrates* (III), 107
 Löfstedt (E.), *Festschrift in honour of*, 1
 Lucas (D. W.) on Leonard and Smith's *Lucretius*, 71
- Maas (P.) on Turyn's *Pindari Epinicia*, 24
 Maat's *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio*, 52
 McDonald (A. H.) on Catin's *En lisant Tite-Live*, 79
 Maguinness (W. S.) *Aristotle Top.* 107²⁸–10: 19
 Manson (T. W.) on Zuntz's *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*, 129
 Markman's *The Horse in Greek Art*, 47
 Marsh's *Modern Problems in the Ancient World*, 40
 Martin (R. H.) *-ere* and *-erunt* in Tacitus, 17
 Mathieu's Budé text of *Isocrates* (III), 107
 Mattingly (H.) on Lattimore's *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, 38
 Maude (A.) and Myres (J. L.) *The Desert Pipe-Line in Herodotus III* 9: 19
 Morel (W.) *Plutarch Mor.* 520 F: 19; A new Greek metrical inscription from Rome, 64
 Mountford (J. F.) on Robertson and Vallette's Budé text of *Apuleius*, 113
 Murray's *The Arbitration*, 25
 Muskens's *De vocis ἀναγωγίας significatione ac usu apud Aristotelem*, 128
 Myres (J. L.) *Aeschylus PV* 707–860: 2 f.
 Myres (J. L.) and Maude (A.) *The Desert Pipe-Line in Herodotus III* 9: 19
- Norberg's *L'Olympionique, Le Poète et leur Renom Éternel*, 75
- Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* (I–IIIa), 83
 Parke (H. W.) and Wormell (D. E. W.) *Lexicographical notes on Delphic Oracles*, 11
 Philippson's *Thessalische Mythologie*, 93
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on D'Hérouville's *L'Astronomie de Virgile et Géorgiques I–II*, 37
 Ponger's *Katalog der griechischen und römischen Skulptur . . . im Allard Pierson Museum*, 119
 postliminium, 63
- Quispel's *De Bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*, 130
- Rand (E. K.), death of, 57
 Rattenbury and Lumb's Budé text of *Heliodorus* (III), 109
 Rattenbury (R. M.) on Haight's *More Essays on Greek Romances*, 33; on Wifstrand's *Eikota* (V), 110; on Clarke's *Greek Studies in England*, 125
 Raven (E. J. P.) *Lucan I* 405–8: 107
redire in civitatem, 63
 Rees (D. A.) on Weiss's *Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles*, 96; on Muskens's *De vocis ἀναγωγίας significatione ac usu apud Aristotelem*, 128
Revue des Études Latines, 1
 Richardson's *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*, 34
 Richter's *Archaic Attic Gravestones*, 49
 Ridley (M. R.) on Bowra's *From Virgil to Milton*, 73
 Robertson and Vallette's Budé text of *Apuleius* (I–III), 113
 Robertson (D. S.) *Juvenal V* 103–6: 19; on Turyn's *The MSS. of Sophocles*, 23; on de Jonge's *Ad Apulei Madaurensis Metamorphoseon librum secundum commentarius*, 82
robustus, 122
- Rose (H. J.) *Aeschylus Pers.* 321: 64; on Festugière's *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 91; on Kerényi's *Hermes der Seelenführer*, Kerényi and Mann's *Romandichtung und Mythologie*, and Philippson's *Thessalische Mythologie*, 93; on Stoessl's *Der Tod des Herakles*, 94; on Vandvik's *The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus*, 96; on Flacelière's *Plutarque sur l'E de Delphes*, 108; on Delcourt's *Oedipe*, 122; on Fontenrose's *Philemon, Lot, and Lycan*, 127
 Rostovtzeff's *Excavations at Dura-Europos* (ninth season, part i), 88
- Sallust, new ninth-century MS. of, 1
 Salmon (E. T.) *The belated Spartan occupation of Decelea*, 13
 Salmon's *History of the Roman World*, 70 A.C.–A.D. 138, 43
 Sandbach (F. H.) on Trevelyan's *Virgil: the Eclogues and the Georgics*, 35
 Selman (C.) on Cahn's *Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos*, 117
 Semple (W. H.) *Virgil Geo. III* 116–17: 61
siligo, 121
 Skutsch (O.) on Atwood and Whittaker's *Excidium Troiae*, 98
 Smith and Leonard's *Lucretius*, 71
 Soury's *Aperçus de Philosophie religieuse chez Maxime de Tyr*, 51; his *La Démonologie de Plutarque*, 70
 Stevens (P. T.) *Euripides El.* 567–8 and *Alc.* 1126–7: 101
 Stoessl's *Der Tod des Herakles*, 94
Studies in Language and Literature, 58
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 53, 98, 131
- Tate (J.) on Hackforth's *Plato's Examination of Pleasure*, 29; on Cherniss's *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, 31; on Cherniss's *Aristotle's Criticism of*

Plato
 de Phi
 on va
 Anwen
 kompos
 Mathie
 Jaeg
 De Ida
 Thompson
 Classic
 Thompson
 Thompson
 Pruden
 Thomson
 Bion, C
 Tierney's
 Tierney's
 Tithonus
 Tod (M.
 béotien
 Toll's Ea
 IV i 1)
 Trevelyan
 triticum
 Trypanis
 text of
 Trypanis
 Turner (E
 Turyn's
 Epinici
 Ure (P. N
 (Final
 van der V
 van Gulik
 Pierson

Note:—

Achilles T
 Aelian V
 Aeschylus
 9 (687—
 321: 64
 2 f.; 88
 Anon. vita
 Anthologia
 Antipho 2
 Apuleius
 Archilochu
 Aristophan
 Aristotle
 1373³⁵
 Alex. 14
 Bion Adon
 Charito i
 Cicero Top
 Claudian A
 [Demosthe
 Diodorus S
 Euripides
 64 f. C
 101 f.; 5
 776: 101
 Heliodorus
 Herodotus
 vii 67: 4
 Hesychius
 Hippocrate
 Teubner
 Homer h. 2

- Plato and the Academy (I), 32; on Soury's *Aperçus de Philosophie religieuse chez Maxime de Tyr*, 51; on van Otterlo's *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*, 96; on Van Hook's *Isocrates* (III) and Mathieu's *Budé text of Isocrates* (III), 107; on Jaeger's *Paideia* (III), 123; on van der Wielen's *De Ideegetallen van Plato*, 127
- Thompson (D'A. W.) on Jasny's *The Wheat of Classical Antiquity*, 120
- Thompson (E. A.) A note on Ricimer, 106
- Thomson (H. J.) on Lavarenne's *Budé text of Prudentius* (I), 78, (II), 116
- Thomson (J. A. K.) The Interpretation of a line in Bion, 61
- Tierney's (J.) *Horace, Epodes and Livy XXVI*, 126
- Tierney's (M.) *Euripides, Hecuba*, 126
- Tithonus, 104
- Tod (M. N.) on Feyel's *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne*, 87
- Toll's *Excavations at Dura-Europos* (Final Report, IV i 1), 50
- Trevelyan's *Virgil: the Eclogues and the Georgics*, 35
- tritium*, 121
- Trypanis (C. A.) on Rattenbury and Lumb's *Budé text of Heliodorus* (III), 109
- Trypanis's *'H' Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Ποίησις* (I), 26
- Turner (E. G.) *Φιλοκενὶν δοκοῦμεν* (Thuc. I.77), 5
- Turyn's *The MSS. of Sophocles*, 23; his *Pindari Epinicia*, 24
- Ure (P. N.) on Toll's *Excavations at Dura-Europos* (Final Report, IV i 1), 50
- van der Wielen's *De Ideegetallen van Plato*, 127
- van Gulik's *Catalogue of the Bronzes in the Allard Pierson Museum* (I), 119
- van Hall's *Over den Oorsprong van de Grieksche Grafstele*, 130.
- Van Hook's *Isocrates* (III), 107
- van Otterlo's *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*, 96
- Vandvik's *The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus*, 96
- Verdenius's *Parmenides*, 68
- Walbank (F. W.) on Feyel's *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie*, 41
- Waltz's *Budé text of Anthologia Palatina* (V, VI), 67
- Wegener's *Some Oxford Papyri*, 83
- Weiss's *Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles*, 96
- Werner's *Der Untergang Roms*, 84
- West and Johnson's *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, 89
- wheat in antiquity, 120
- Wifstrand's *Eikola* (V), 110
- Wilkinson (L. P.) on Norberg's *L'Olympionique, le Poète et leur Renom Éternel*, 75; on Fränkel's *Ovid*, 76
- Wilkinson's *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*, 74
- Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) *Choephoroi* 691-9 (687-95), 58 f.
- Wormell (D. E. W.) and Parke (H. W.) *Lexicographical notes on Delphic Oracles*, 11
- Wright (T. E.) on Campbell's *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina cum Epodis*, 112
- Wycherley (R. E.) on Waltz's *Budé text of Anthologia Palatina* (V, VI), 67
- Zuntz's *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*, 129

II. INDEX LOCORVM

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

- Achilles Tattus passim: 111
- Aelian *VH* 3 43: 13
- Aeschylus passim: 58 f. *Ag.* 877 ff.: 59. *Cho.* 691-9 (687-95): 58 f. *Eu.* 250: 12. *Pers.* 320-2: 4; 321: 64. *Prom. Sol.* fr. 191: 2 f. *PV* 707-869: 2 f.; 880: 5.
- Anon. *vita Platonis* p. 9 l. 33: 11
- Anthologia Palatina* vii-viii passim: 68; xiv 66: 12
- Antipho *Tetr.* I i 1: 8
- Apuleius *Met.* passim: 113 ff.
- Archilochus fr. 67: 103
- Aristophanes *Av.* 623: 10; *Eq.* 795: 101
- Aristotle passim: 128. *Phys.* ii 4-6: 96. *Rhet.* 1373^a35: 5; 1400^a19: 5; 1413^b28: 103. *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1444^a30: 5. *Top.* 107^a8-10: 19
- Bion *Adon. Epit.* 23-4: 61
- Charito i 13 9: 111
- Cicero *Top.* 37: 63; *Verr.* II iii 13, iv 72: 14
- Claudian *RP* i 171-2: 63
- [Demosthenes] xl 32, lvi 14: 6
- Diodorus Siculus vii 12 2: 13; viii 29: 12
- Euripides *Alc.* 315: 101; 1126-8: 102. *Ba.* passim: 64 f. *Cycl.* 455: 9; 615: 8. *El.* 556: 102; 567-8: 101 f.; 568: 102. *Hel.* 199: 4. *HF* 1399: 101. *Or.* 776: 101. *Rh.* 43: 11. *Tro.* 847 f.: 104; 982: 101
- Heliodorus passim: 109-10, 111
- Herodotus i 86: 5; 215: 5; iii 9: 19; 14: 4; v 79: 101; vii 67: 4; 78: 4; 141: 12; ix 73: 14
- Hesychius *Mil. FHG* iv 147: 12
- Hippocrates *περί διατρῆς οἴκων* 3 (i, p. 110, l. 10 Teubner): 101
- Homer *h. Herm.* 573: 93. *Il.* xi 86: 9; xvi 128: 101
- Horace passim: 105, 112 f. *C.* i 1: 75; i 28 7-15, 24: 103 f.; iv 7 25-6: 104. *Epp.* i 19 41: 16
- IG* vii 1-14: 41; 2433: 42; 3473: 41
- Inscr. Magn.* 17, 215: 12
- Isocrates passim: 107 f.
- Juvenal i 5 70: 121; v 103-6: 19
- Livy ix 11 10: 63; xxxviii 21 4: 42; xli 8 11: 63
- Lucan i 405-8: 107
- Lucilius xiv 23 Müll.: 62
- Lucretius iii 221: 104
- Lysias x 2: 5
- Martial xiv 199: 62
- Nonius 17 23: 62
- Oenomaus ap. Euseb. *PE* passim: 12
- Ovid passim: 77. *F.* i 461, vi 473: 104. *Her.* ix 147: 95. *Met.* passim: 104 f.
- Pausanias viii i 6: 8; viii 45 1: 19; ix 18 5: 12; ix 37 4: 12
- Pindar passim: 24. *I.* vi 41: 10; 52: 4. *N.* v 51: 10, 11. *O.* vii 65: 10.
- Plato *Epp.* vii passim: 7 f.; 332 c 6 ff., 335 a 7 ff.: 7. *Grg.* 449 b: 7. *Lg.* i 643 c 7; 711 e 7: 8. *Meno* 94 e: 101. *Phdr.* 244 c, 245 a, b: 8. *Rp.* 473 c f.: 8. *Soph.* 242 b: 7. *Th.* 145 c: 102
- Pliny *HN* viii 67: 62
- Plutarch *Avat.* 53: 12. *Cleom.* 11: 42. *De E ap. Delph.* 387 c, 392 f, 393 b: 108-9. *Mor.* 520 f, 966 c: 19. *Philop.* 9: 42
- Polyaenus 6 53: 12
- Polybius passim: 41 f.
- Porphyryon ap. Euseb. *PE* passim: 11-12
- Priscus fr. 24 (= *FHG* iv p. 102 a): 106

Propertius i 11 30: 117
 Prudentius *Apoth.*, *Ham.* passim: 116. *Cath.* 10
 9-16, 12 130: 78
 Ps.-Democr. *Symp. Ant.* p. 5 G: 8
 Ps.-Plutarch *vit. Hom.* p. 242 (Allen): 12
 Quintilian xii 10 27-8: 20
 Seneca *Dial.* passim: 38. *Epp.* 40 fin.: 62. *Herc.*
Fur. 623: 105
 Silius Italicus iii 335-6, x 461, xii 518: 62
 Sophocles *At.* 82: 8. *Aleat.* fr. 85: 102. *El.* 515: 4.
OC 1179-80: 101. *Ph.* 777: 4; 1448: 111. *Tr.*
 313: 8; 766: 8; 1168, 1195: 9
 Statius *Ach.* i 59-60: 62; ii 331: 117. *Theb.* vii
 145 f.: 62

Strabo ix 1 20 p. 397: 14
 Suidas s.v. *Διογένης*: 13
 Terence *Andr.* 126: 16
 Theophrastus *CP* iv 6 3, *HP* viii 2 3, 4 1: 121
 Thucydides i passim: 28 f.; i 77: 5; i 84: 8; ii 49 6: 64
 v 31: 8; vi 91 6: 14; vi 91 7: 13; vii 19: 13; vii 27,
 28: 13; viii 11 3: 13; viii 69: 13
 Valerius Flaccus vii 463: 82
 Virgil passim: 61 f., 104 f. *Aen.* ii 16, 112, 186, 250
 9; viii 357-8: 129; viii 452: 16. *Geo.* passim: 37
 iii. 116-17: 61; iv 174: 16
 Xenophanes fr. 30 4 D: 103
 Xenophon passim: 10-11; *Anab.* i 10 12: 10

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

αἰ κ(αί) (in records of pay-
 ments), 89

αἰχμή, 5
 αἰώρα, 11
 ἀμάντευτος, 12
 ἀναβαίνει 'go up', 11
 ἀναλογία, 128
 ἀνατείνω, 10
 ἀντίθεος, 11
 ἀπεναντίον, 12
 ἄρδης, 5
 ἀσέβημα, 12
 ἀφηνερέφης, 12
 δοκός, δόκος, 103
 δρακοντίας, 121
 δρῦς, 8
 ἐμφρων, 8
 ἐνδοκος, 103

ἐνληρος, 12
 ἐπιγαμία, 84
 ἐπικτητος, 12
 εὐάριτος, 12
 εὐτμητος, 12
 ζεῖα ἀπλή, 121
 ἥελις 'eye', 12
 θεόπρος, 12
 θυρέος, θυρεοφόροι, 42
 καγχρυδίας, 121
 καταναίετῶ, 12
 κάττος, 19
 κλήζω, 12
 κορώνη, 12
 κριθανίας, 121
 λογισμός, 13
 μέλεα, 68
 μικρὸς πυρός, 121

μύχατος, 12
 νέως (adverb), 12
 ξανθός, 48
 ὄλυρα, 121
 ὁμόνοια, 13
 παραιτητός, 13
 παρώας, 48
 πέλται, πελτοφόροι, 42
 πέλτη, 10
 πένθος 'suffering', 4
 πείρα 'sappy', 9
 πολύπονος, 4
 πολύστονος, 4
 πρεσβηγενής, 12
 πώτημα, 12
 ῥυπαρός (of drachmae),
 89
 σελινοῦσιος, 121

σεμίδαλις, 121
 σίλυντις, σιλινγενίτης ἄρπη,
 122
 σιτανίας, 121
 σίτος μελαναθήρ, 121
 στλεγγὺς Ἀλεξάνδρειος,
 122
 στραγγίς, 121
 σύνειμι (of the harvest),
 12
 τίφη, 121
 τορευτής, 118
 τράγος, 121
 ὑποχείριος, 12
 φιλοδικεῖν, φιλόδικος, 5
 φρονεῖν, 8
 χόνδρος, 121

6: 64
vii 27

, 25
n: 37

āpr

ios,

vesa

, 5



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.
E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.
L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1946

LATIN

368 Q. CURTIUS: HISTORY OF ALEXANDER. Two volumes. Translated by J. C. Rolfe.
369

GREEK

375 DIODORUS SICULUS. Twelve volumes; Vol. IV (Books IX-XII. 40). Translated by C. H. Oldfather.
376 DIO CHRYSOSTOM. Five volumes; Vol. IV (Discourses XXXVII-LX). Translated by H. Lamar Crosby.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingwood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

THE
WORLD'S GREATEST BOOKSHOP

FOYLES
★ ★ ★ FOR BOOKS ★ ★ ★

New and secondhand
Books on every subject

Stock of 3 million
volumes

WE BUY BOOKS, TOO

119-125 CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2

Garrard 5660 (x6 lines) * Open 9-6 (incl. Sat.)

CLASSICAL ★ BOOKS ★

As of all subjects, we hold a very large stock of Classical Books both new and second-hand. Owing to paper restrictions we are not able to issue our usual catalogues, but we will gladly answer all inquiries. We are anxious to purchase good Classical Books as well as good books in every field of Literature, Science, and Arts

W. HEFFER  & SONS LTD

3-4 Petty Cury Cambridge

Nicanor of Athens

O. F. GRAZEBROOK

The 'autobiography' of an unknown citizen who met Socrates and Plato, knew (and disliked) Xenophon, was present at the first performance of The Knights and fought by sea and land against Sparta. 'What a commonplace man thought about antiquity when it was happening and the immortals was certainly worth knowing . . . really a notable piece of work.'—G. M. YOUNG. 10s. 6d. net

From Imperium to Auctoritas

A Historical Study of
Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire
49 B.C.—A.D. 14

MICHAEL GRANT

An examination of all the bronze and copper coins struck between the time of Julius Caesar and the death of Augustus, and an attempt at their correct attribution. Certain problems of Roman Government are reconsidered in the light of this new evidence. 12 pp. of plates.

£3. 3s. net

Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics

RHYS CARPENTER

In this new book from the University of California Press, the Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens affirms that the Iliad and Odyssey were composed, one early, the other late, in the seventh century B.C., and that neither bears any relation to the historical Mycenaean world; their ultimate source lies in oral poems, closely related to the Beowulf epic, of European rather than Greek origin. 14s. net

Cambridge University Press

